

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 6668. A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Hoffman, doing business under the trade name Pyro Guard Service Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 6669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara M. Stamat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6670. A bill to provide for the return to the athletic and recreation fund of Fort MacArthur, Calif., of certain proceeds of the show, Hey Rookie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6671. A bill for the relief of Joseph Komarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6672. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margot Wartenberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 6673. A bill for the relief of Manuel Mello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6674. A bill for the relief of Abdul Ali Munshi (also known as Abdul Mojid Munshi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 6675. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Leibovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 6676. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pollina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 6677. A bill for the relief of the last three surviving members of the Confederate States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

305. By Mr. ANFUSO: Petition of Anthony Calapai and others living in Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that retirement under social security be reduced from age 65 to the age of 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

306. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Western Association of College and University Business Officers, Bursar College of Puget Sound, Wash., relative to a resolution adopted at the 17th annual meeting of the Western Association of College and University Business Offices at Tucson, Ariz., relating to requesting and urging the Government to increase funds available for the student housing program, at the lowest possible interest rate without actual subsidy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foreign Affairs Address by Hon. William E. Jenner, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me before the Magna Charta Dames, at Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1955, on the subject of our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT

(Address of Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, before Magna Charta Dames, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 19, 1955)

Edgar Allen Poe tells a story of a beautiful house, whose fine lines and perfect proportions stood out against the landscape, and brought a sense of dignity and strength to all the neighborhood.

Nothing happened to the house, that is, no outward blow or injury. But it was affected by an inward decay. The change was imperceptible, nothing one could grasp or measure. But slowly the great house changed. All its strength and beauty disintegrated until it became only a corpse of a house, ready to fall into dust.

This story, called the Fall of the House of Usher, is a symbol of American foreign policy over the last 7 or 8 years.

Even a few years ago, our country stood like a tower of strength, bringing security not only to our own people but to those who loved freedom everywhere.

Nothing has happened to our country, at least not outwardly. No one has attacked it. No blow has been struck. But it has suffered an inner decay. The change is almost imperceptible. No event or act marks a clear turning point. It is almost impossible to grasp what has happened. But the beauty and dignity and strength of America are slowly dying. The noble edifice of constitutional liberty is silently disintegrating, into a crumbling ruin.

How dare I stand before you and make such a statement, when no single injury or weakness is visible, no single event marks the moment when the sickness struck?

I am going to remind you of the various foreign policies of the American Government over the last years, but I shall have to make two lists. First, I shall describe the bold new policy that was pronounced at each successive stage. Then I shall describe the pitiful craven policy that replaced it in action.

This continuous silent disintegration of every policy we make is due to the most important political fact in the world today. We have in the United States not one center of government policy but two. One center I shall call the collectivist one worlders. The other is the legal constitutional government.

The collectivist bloc has been operating now for 20 years. It has the strong root system that comes from 20 years of unhampered growth. The chief characteristic of this collectivist bloc is that it operates above the Constitution and above the law. Its members are carrying out a secret revolutionary purpose, without any attempt to tell the American people what they are doing, or asking their consent.

I say that there is an irrepressible conflict between this elite which operates above the Constitution and the laws, and the American people, and those Members of Congress, of the courts, and of the executive branch, who operate under the Constitution and the law.

I am taking foreign policy as the best example of the tug-of-war going on constantly within the United States, between these two forms of government.

In the Teheran-Yalta period, roughly 1942 to 1946, the Big Three dominated world policy-making. The American elite, working with the Communist leadership, dominated the Big Three. The elite gave the Soviet Union the great heartland of Central Europe from the Baltic States to the borders of Greece. They let East Germany fall to the Reds. They gave the U. S. S. R. the keys to the heartland of Asia, Mainland China.

You will ask why did Britain and the United States agree to this remaking of the world when there was no profit in it except for Stalin and his friends? Recent publication of the Yalta papers, and the much-needed publication of the Teheran and Potsdam records will show how the elite were dizzy with success from exercising their fantastic war powers.

I am concerned with a later, and I believe a far more dangerous period.

The American people were never foolish enough to accept the Soviet Union as an ally. We did not accept the Czar's government as our ally in the First World War against Germany. The idea of our alliance with the U. S. S. R. is a myth, invented by the political elite and spread by their docile press.

Many in the Government, in the military service and in the press, had grave doubts about the postwar conduct of the Soviet Union but they could not be heard in the din of victory.

Slowly the true Americans began to point out the danger to our security. The first victory of the pro-American group was signaled by the Forrestal proposal of military support for Greece and Turkey. President Truman told the Congress on March 12, 1947, "At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. . . ."

"One way of life is based on the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression."

"The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms."

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

Isn't that the recent Formosa resolution? There is no appeasement here.

We made one serious mistake in understanding this pronouncement.

We believed that the American Government could reach a policy decision by constitutional means, and make it stick. We took for granted that resistance to Communist attack would remain our national policy.

If the President had stated what was official policy, what could hinder us from following the new course? We did not believe the one essential fact—the collectivist, global, pro-Soviet elite never quits. It only goes underground, until the conflict is forgotten. Then it surfaces again, ready for action, while we sleep. It puts on a new cover of pro-Americanism, but it is unchanged.

From 1947 to today the collectivist elite has let the pro-Americans win the public victories, but it has promptly pulverized the true American policies in secret.

It may help to call the globalist-collectivist-pro-Russian group the Acheson group.

We are, however, dealing with something much stronger than personalities. Forrestal is dead, but his policy has been revived again and again. Acheson is gone, but the evil that he did lives after him.

The important point is that we did not have a united American Government which could, after debate, set a final American policy. We had two centers of policymaking competing for mastery.

The globalists made no attempt to attack or debate the Forrestal policy of rearming. They set out secretly to undermine it, so that it would sink slowly, silently into the ground, and collapse in a heap of dust.

As soon as they thought it safe their tame columnists began to beat the drums. Their friends in the State Department and other Government agencies came forward piously with their loaded proposals—always under a carefully innocent surface, proposals to sabotage hard military resistance and go back to the Teheran-Yalta policies.

You know what happened to Forrestal. You may not remember what happened to his successor, Louis Johnson. He tried desperately, with reduced appropriations, to get American military forces in readiness in 1950. A few weeks after the Korean war began, the columnists who worked with the elite began a bitter attack on him. He was let out summarily. He learned from the newspapermen of his replacement by General Marshall.

On the foreign-policy front the collectivist one worlders diverted the Truman doctrine for hard military aid against communism into the Marshall plan for economic aid for the people in the line of march of the Communist legions. I have said again and again that the Marshall plan was Greek-Turkish aid with its claws pulled. It could roar fiercely at Soviet Russia but never hurt it. In fact, it was setting the table for Stalin, enriching the countries the Soviet Union intended to take without conquest.

Was President Truman to blame for abandonment of the hard Truman doctrine and its replacement by the soft policy of economic aid? I do not say so. So long as two competing centers of power battle for control of the American Government, any President is nearly helpless. The elite was stronger than President Roosevelt. It was stronger than President Truman. Early in 1952, in describing the Colossus on the Potomac, I said I did not want President Truman to head up such powers. I did not want any Democratic President to head up such powers, and I did not want any Republican President to head up such powers.

Neither am I criticizing the Democratic Party. This supraconstitutional elite is stronger than any American political party. Slowly our security deteriorated on every front.

In June 1948, Senator Vandenberg had introduced the resolution authorizing a regional pact with European nations. He did not suspect this was one of the interchangeable parts in the plan for NATO. Our security was tied to nations in which nearly one-third of the electors voted Communist, and where the trade unions, seaports, rail lines, and other services were under tight Communist control.

Secretary Acheson drew a line in the Pacific leaving Korea to the Communist Empire. Our troops were withdrawn and Formosa was solemnly excluded from the territory necessary to make the Pacific a peaceful lake, and to keep the west coast of the United States secure.

When the Communists struck in Korea, the collectivist one worlders talked victory, but they set out secretly to undermine it, to belittle it, to tie it up in a legal maze. You remember the steps.

The one-worlders put our troops under the United Nations, but the U. N. included Soviet Russia and her satellites. They pre-

tended we were fighting the war in Korea for Korea, though the war actually was for all Asia, and it should have been fought on the territory of the real enemy—Red China. The elite diverted badly needed American troops to Europe in spite of bitter opposition in Congress. Then when victory was in sight, they agreed to a cease-fire on terms the Soviet Union had proclaimed 6 months before.

Our pro-American military and naval officers pulled us out of the cease-fire negotiations with honor. They refused to return the anti-Communist Chinese prisoners of war to the Communists to be murdered like the hostages surrendered at Yalta.

That success, however, was not to last. In December, 1952, at the U. N., Krishna-Menon, in league with the American one-worlders, rewrote the cease-fire agreement, and provided for a new brainwashing of the pitiful prisoners, so the Communists could be saved from the disgrace of losing most of the Chinese soldiers, who found a chance to get away.

In the election of 1952 the American people voted overwhelmingly for pro-American foreign and military policies, but that meant nothing to the globalist elite. They went underground again.

President Eisenhower replaced an obsequious Joint Chiefs of Staff with a vigorous pro-American body. Secretary Wilson and the new Joint Chiefs set out to repair the damage from our "accordion" defense policy, which by running appropriations up and down has kept our military program in turmoil.

President Eisenhower also rescinded the shameful order by which the 7th Fleet had been sent to defend the Red China coast against the Nationalist blockade.

Peace was imminent in Korea. The American military were aware of our obligation to make sure the battle-hardened Chinese armies in North Korea were not moved to another place on the chessboard, like Indochina, to capture more millions of human slaves.

Americans breathed easy for the first time in many years. That was our mistake. It was the moment the elite were waiting for.

The one-world collectivists knew they could soon surface again, and reduce to dust the courageous policies of the President and the Joint Chiefs.

In Berlin in February 1954, the Red Chinese were given de facto recognition as the legal Government of China, on equal footing with the United States.

The siege of Dien Bien Phu, which had some of the earmarks of a planned disaster, focused the world's attention on the difficulties of jungle fighting. In a theatrical atmosphere of defeat the Western nations surrendered at Geneva half of the richest section of Asia, the military key to the South Pacific.

Our military were caught napping. Suddenly they talked of entering the Indochinese war by sending Americans to fight on the soil of Indochina. The only sound strategy would have been to equip both the South Koreans and the Nationalists to the highest point of efficiency and then say to Red China—"The instant there is a Communist uprising in Indochina, the Koreans and Nationalists will move in on your railroads and airfields."

We can have confidence in the patriotism and intelligence of our military men. It was from them I learned of the pitiful transportation lines from North to South China. From them I learned of the ease with which railroads and airfields can be bombed from sea and air, without landing a single American foot soldier on the mainland of Asia.

Why did we fail to release Korean and Nationalist planes against the supply lines that led to Indochina? I am certain from reading the columnists that our military

officials had the right plans but were outwitted by the collectivist elite.

Our military leaders—like most Americans—have not yet accepted the fact that we have two centers of policymaking within our Government, one under the Constitution, the other above it. One works for American security. The other would put an end to American independence. We can have no rest until one or the other of these power centers is destroyed, and the American Government is unified again.

I have not even begun to list the brave and dignified pro-American policies which saw the light for a little while, and then were turned to dust by this secret undermining. Our European policy is tied in with plans for Atlantic community, in which a supranational agency in NATO will have superior control over our troops, our foreign policy, our funds, and our right to withdraw.

Our German policy has been subordinated to plans for one world through the knitting together of the Atlantic community in NATO.

Our Asian policy is tied to the hated colonial powers through SEATO. We are allied with everybody except the nations which have fought communism. The Nationalists are permanently leashed, in the China Defense Treaty. The Koreans are going to be allowed to die on the vine.

The brave showing of the Formosa resolution has already been replaced by a series of proposals meant to let it disintegrate into a heap of dust. The countermoves include appeals for a cease fire, intervention of U. N., confusion over Quemoy and Matsu, appeals to bring our allies into the defense of Formosa, recognition of two Chinas, trusteeship for Formosa, and a plebiscite of the inhabitants.

Let us remember one thing. The issue in the Formosa Strait is not Formosa. It is the whole free world. At Formosa Strait, all the free nations are lined up face to face with the Communist empire. We cannot retreat an inch at Formosa without endangering Korea, Indochina, Germany, Italy, and California.

The Strait of Formosa is the danger spot in the long line that encircles the Communist empire, and keeps it from world conquest. If Quemoy is abandoned, the whole line falls back. The Strait of Formosa is the Korean battleline, it is the Berlin airlift, it is the Battle of Britain. It is Valley Forge. It is Thermopylae.

The elite will work incessantly to undermine, to corrode, to pulverize the Formosa policy, because it is the Truman doctrine of Greek-Turkish aid, the military intervention in Korea, the landing at Normandy. It is the doctrine that there can be no compromise morally with communism, that the only answer to force is readiness to use force, and that America cannot stand by and see her friends, the free anti-Communist nations, ground to dust, so the road will be clear for a Soviet attack on us.

I am not going to discuss a plan of action for this crisis. It is more important to understand the nature of the crisis.

The contest between the one-world elite and our constitutional government is an irrepressible conflict. The American Government cannot operate half under the law and half above it.

We cannot take care of any other business, including national defense, until this conflict is decided. There is no way by which foreign nations can trust our public statements if they do not know whether the one-world elite or the constitutional officials will have the final word.

If the contest continues much longer, the elite have won. We cannot defend our country or help other nations to remain free, if our policies shuttle back and forth from one power center to another. The elite does not have to win. Their purpose is destruction. Every move they make helps

their final victory. They can send our defense appropriations up and down, arbitrarily increase and decrease the number of members of our Armed Forces, make treaties with other nations in which the fine print gives away our position. No matter how hard the true American resistance may work, our policy will look faltering and feeble. Our word will be without value. We shall antagonize all our friends and build up the strength of our mortal enemies. Like the House of Usher, the dignity and strength of America will deteriorate from invisible hurt.

The task of uprooting the elite cannot be left to any one person or group. The President alone cannot do it. Congress alone cannot do it. Neither party alone can do it. It is a task for all Americans, in Congress, in executive office, in the courts, among the press, the scholars, and the people.

Second, while the elite is in power, nothing can be settled by agreements. The American Government and political system have always operated under a kind of gentlemen's agreement—that no one seeking office or in office would do a single thing to weaken the Constitution. Limited government is government by mutual trust. In a happy family we do not frisk each member to be sure he does not carry hidden guns. In a happy country we do not have to investigate each officeholder to be sure he does not carry a deadly weapon with which to slash at the Constitution.

We shall never go back to that world of mutual trust, until we drive out of office and positions of power, the men who are not playing the game according to the rules, the men who desire power even when it means the sacrifice of honor.

The elite keep no agreements, whether it is the Truman-Forrestal doctrine, or the Korean cease-fire or the Formosa resolution. They regard agreements as a play to fool the innocent, behind which they can constantly chip away at any program which would strengthen our country.

The principal burden of removing the elite falls, I believe, on Congress. Congress must take back the money it has given the elite to consolidate its influence. Congress must take back the loose powers which it has carelessly surrendered. Congress must rescind any legislation which commits us to the collectivist one-world supergovernment which is so rapidly taking over the world. Congress must strengthen every official and every sector of our Government which operates under the Constitution and adheres to the ideals of the founders of our Nation.

We must plainly tell other countries that if they do not wish to get rid of their own collectivist elite we are through. I said "through." We cannot give economic aid or military aid to nations governed by a collectivist elite friendly to communism. We must build American policy on firm agreements with nations which have cleaned their own house.

If the American people will recognize their real enemy, and their real danger; if they will work together to destroy every vestige of collectivist supergovernment which has grown up since 1933, I have no doubt of the outcome.

This is the only road to peace. The Communists in Russia are not strong enough or smart enough to destroy the free nations without help of their supporters from within other countries. If we join hands with any nation working to rid itself of a fifth-column elite, we can build a ring of steel about the Soviet Empire. When it is shut off from new conquests, from the resources it must get from its secret allies in the free countries, the Soviet Government will wither away, and the people who live under slavery can once again be free.

If we fight this one battle, we can look forward to a world of peace, of law, of decency, of honest agreements. This world can

be built on a firm foundation of government under law, obeying the desires of decent moral people.

The American people know we have inherited the most perfect design for a government under law and serving the ideals of harmony and truth. We do not need to seek a new way of life. We need only be true to our own great ideals. Then we shall emerge from the shadows strong and clean and free, and give to the world the glad tidings that America is true to herself once more.

Beyond Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Beyond Formosa," delivered by me before the Foreign Policy Association, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEYOND FORMOSA

(Address by Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, delivered before Foreign Policy Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 4, 1955)

During recent years the United States has been confronted with a succession of crises in Asia. None has been more complex than the one which we now face in Formosa. I should like to begin this discussion therefore by reviewing the background of our present involvement in that region.

When the Chinese Communists came to power on the mainland in 1949, the Government of the Republic of China moved to Formosa. The United States continued to recognize that Government and only that Government. Since the outbreak of Communist aggression in Korea, almost 5 years ago, our military forces have been committed to preventing the Chinese Communists from seizing Formosa. This policy, instituted by former President Truman, has had the continuing support of Congress. It has also had the overwhelming support of both great political parties.

Last year, in December, the Secretary of State concluded a defense treaty with the Republic of China which had the effect of formally acknowledging this policy. For some reason, which in my opinion has never been satisfactorily explained, the President saw fit not to wait for the Senate's consent to ratification of that treaty. Instead, in the interim, he sent to the Congress a joint resolution on the defense of Formosa. The resolution neither added to nor subtracted from the terms of the defense treaty which was subsequently ratified.

In debating the Formosa resolution in the Senate there was no question of the determination of that body that Formosa should be defended. That was never at issue. The debate, rather, centered on two other questions. One was the question of whether Congress should endorse in advance a possible American military action in the Formosan Straits and on the Chinese mainland, acts over which Congress could have no control and the validity of which it could have no way of determining. I stated at the time that in my judgment under the Constitution only Congress had the power to declare war but that short of war the President had powers as Commander in Chief

and in the execution of foreign policy. I further stated that his powers and his responsibility in the latter connection could not be diluted, obscured, transferred, or divided, resolutions of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding. After the President gave assurances, in effect, that he alone would assume responsibility for any use of force in the Formosan region, without a declaration of war, the resolution was accepted by the Senate. Had we not had those Presidential assurances, that resolution would have been an open invitation to irresponsibility and might very well have been rejected by the Senate.

The second side issue in the Formosan debate was the relation of the coastal islands of the Quemoy and the Matsu to the safeguarding of Formosa. In this discussion the Senate was attempting to place the defense of the coastal islands—in the perspective of our national interests rather than those of the Chinese Nationalist Government. In consequence, it was clear by the time the resolution passed that Congress supported the defense of Formosa and nothing more. We were not approving any military crusade on the mainland of Asia or any defense of the offshore islands for the sake of the offshore islands. I know that my own vote was cast with that understanding and I so stated. Many other Members of the Senate expressed similar sentiments.

The responsibility for carrying out the defense of Formosa—and it is a heavy burden—remains the responsibility of the President. It seems to me that the best way that Americans can lighten that burden is by refraining at this time from attempts to whittle away at his responsibility. The President is entrusted with the defense of Formosa. It is for him to decide whether to defend the coastal islands or to engage our forces in their defense. He is accountable to the American people for whatever action he may or may not take. But to attempt to tie his hands now in advance, either for or against their defense, will serve only to deepen the difficult crisis in which we find ourselves.

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the Formosan resolution, if it had to come to Congress at all, came in the vague fashion that it did. Once having been made public, however, Congress was faced with little alternative but to accept it in that form or weaken the President's position in dealing with the Far Eastern crisis.

My concern today is not with predicting the outcome of the Formosan crisis. I do not know whether the vagueness of our position on the coastal islands will either avert war or plunge us into war. No one can make a meaningful prediction of that kind. I believe that remains the case despite the growing prospects of peace talks between the United States and the Communists. These talks, in my opinion, should not be ruled out but they should be approached with the greatest caution.

I would address the main body of my remarks today to the proposition that the difficult situation in which we find ourselves, respecting the Quemoy and the Matsu is merely an external symptom of our problems in the Far East. The underlying causes for these problems are to be found in forces and pressures which exist inside the body of Asia. They are also to be found in pressures and forces which are exerted from outside Asia. If there is to be peace in that part of the world—if there are to be long-term solutions in Asia, it is to these causes that our attention must be turned. It is of importance that we understand not only what these forces are but what happens in Asia when the pressures from outside the continent collide with those from within. In particular it is of importance that the role of military force in our policy in Asia be examined—not so much from the standpoint of its use as an ultimate recourse in war but its role as a

deterrent before war breaks out. That is the way we have been called upon to use it, except in Korea, since the end of World War II.

The crisis in the Formosan Straits is not an isolated incident. It is part of a chain reaction identified with last year's crisis in Indochina and before that with the crisis in Korea. In dealing with the crisis in Formosa our attention is easily diverted from developments which next year may result in a crisis in Laos, Thailand, and Indonesia. By the following year, if not sooner, the crisis of Japan may be full upon us.

The interrelated problems in Asia include the conspicuous threats of Communist territorial expansion in Korea, Indochina, and Formosa. It also is interwoven, however, with less-evident threats. There is pressure within Japan for an expansion of trade. To the extent that this pressure seeks an outlet in closer economic and cultural relations with the Chinese mainland, it affects the unity of policy among members of the free world with respect to Communist China. There is also a mounting pressure among the so-called neutral states of South Asia for peaceful relations with Communist China. The attitude of these states toward developments in Formosa must be seen in the context of that broader consideration. In considering the totality of our situation in Asia, moreover, we cannot ignore the possibility that the outbreak of hostilities in the Chinese coastal islands could signalize a resumption of hostilities in Korea and Indochina. Finally, behind the complex of these factors in Asia we must also reckon with the relationship between the actions of Communist China and the policy of the Soviet Union.

During recent years we have been attempting to deal with these various pressures largely by economic and military means and sometimes in a seemingly disconnected fashion. We have contributed to the economic development of the free countries of Asia. We have attempted at the same time to strengthen the defenses of the free-Asian countries. These positive efforts have been dimmed, however, by the recurrent crises. From the Korean crisis we rushed too late to Indochina to quench a fire which had spread beyond control. We now have rushed to the fire in Formosa. We may be blinded by the glare in Formosa to the fire which is being kindled in Japan. We have exercised in recent years a kind of "chain reaction" diplomacy, a kind of crisis-foreign policy. We have jumped from the effects of one crisis to its successor. We have, in short, never been ahead of the game. That the crises continue to occur seems to me evidence that either our positive measures have been insufficient or the situation has been beyond our control by measures which we could support at that time. I think it is probably a little of both. There are limits to what we can do to control the flow of events in Asia, short of war and even with war.

That does not mean our answer is to pick up our marbles and go home. Asia is too important to us, to our security, and to our other national interests to permit that kind of response. That would simply amount to postponing the day of reckoning.

We have not exhausted our possibilities of dealing with the situation when we employ measures of economic aid and military aid. It seems to me we have overlooked another which costs far less and yet can be more far-reaching in its effect.

That ingredient I believe lies in the realm of attitudes and ideas. I am not talking about psychological warfare which holds that you can win with tricky words and slick advertising slogans battles which cannot be won with infantry rifles. I think the lesson of the unleashing of Chiang has put to rest that fallacious concept. But if the battle in Asia is essentially a struggle of ideas it is in the spirit as well as in the economic

and military arena wherein peace and long-term solutions may possibly be found.

What I am suggesting is that we examine the Asian attitudes or states of mind which give rise to many of the basic pressures with which we must deal. I am suggesting, too, that we examine Asian reactions to our own state of mind and our actions. Perhaps, then, we will find some of the answers to the peace we seek. Such answers will not lead to a purchased peace, or a power peace. They could, however, lead to a peace based on mutual understanding and common interest.

We have grown too accustomed to wrapping all the ills of Asia into the single package marked "militant communism." Of course this threat exists; we have seen over 500 million Chinese brought under the potential influence of that ideology. Countless millions more are threatened with it. We have spent blood to prevent the conquest of Korea by Communist aggression. Too late, we saw Viet-Nam north of the 17th parallel brought within the orbit of communism. We have seen militant Communist expansionism accompanied by political penetration, by organized propaganda, by the activities of disciplined cadres of intimidators and by calculated economic penetration. Military offensives have been alternated with the allurements of the peace offensive with its offers of trade, industrialization and cultural exchanges. Today in free Viet-Nam we see Viet Minh agents using blackmail, bribery, and intimidation in attempting to undermine the Diem government. We see the Communist created shadow government of Pathet Lao in northern Laos and another Communist penetration headed by a former premier of Thailand, Pridi, in Southeast Asia.

We see the new maps of China which brazenly incorporate territory from its southern neighbors. We see new military highways under construction in south China. In Indonesia the Communist Party has recently been reorganized and its activities accelerated. The trade offensive directed at Japan is beginning to cause a wavering in that country. In North Korea the truce has been violated and the area has been placed within a stranglehold of Communist control. And now, the Communist sword is pointed at Formosa. It is all too evident that militant communism is a force in Asia. But why, we may well ask ourselves, has it not met with more resistance? Why hasn't Asian nationalism which in great measure was stimulated by our own revolution interposed a more formidable bulwark to the Communist advance? We have assumed in recent years that by taking measures to alleviate the extreme poverty of Asia, we might guide Asian nationalism toward our own precepts of democracy. We have also assumed that by arming it heavily we could prevent a Communist penetration. These efforts have not been conspicuously successful. Perhaps, in part, the difficulty lies in the failure to recognize the spiritual basis of Asian nationalism.

The peoples of Asia, looking out on the West, see the high material standard of living which has followed in the wake of the industrial revolution. Asia was left in the backwash by the sweep of Western industrialism. The surge of democracy which spread through Europe and the Americas following our revolution and the French Revolution bypassed Asia at that time. In consequence, as the decades passed the differences between Eastern and Western standards of living widened, as did the gap between the political controllers and the controlled in Asia. For more than a century these differences burned deeper and deeper in the hearts and minds of the peoples of the Orient. The bitterness was fed not only by the desire for the material achievements of the West but also by the demands of pride and prestige. Although the West

brought some benefits, the era of colonialism was widely viewed in Asia as hampering the development of the peoples of Asia in their own right. Colonialism was backed by Western force and in the minds of many Asians, force is indelibly identified with their ancient and deep-seated grievances against that system.

Although the era of colonialism is almost over in Asia, its after effects remain. There is extreme sensitivity among Asians and especially among Asian leaders about being recognized and dealt with on a basis of absolute equality by the West. There is an urge to express their new-found independence in independent action. An enthusiasm also exists for rapid economic development—a desire to bridge the wide economic gap—between the East and West. At the same time, however, dependence upon the West for economic aid contradicts the underlying urge of the Asian nations to prove their independence and equality. There exists most of all an ever-present sensitivity, an often unreasonable sensitivity, to any action which resembles a return of the colonial relationships of an earlier era.

In this context it is understandable that Communist China's defiance of the West finds considerable emotional support from many Asians including those who staunchly oppose communism. It explains in part the support of some Asian governments for the recognition of Communist China and for its admission to the United Nations. It is an important element in explaining the initial successes of the Viet Minh in Indochina. The deep-seated attitudes of Asia toward the West form an emotional and psychological base which is readily exploited by Communist propaganda. An understanding of this fact is pertinent to any understanding of the behavior of the uncommitted states of Asia, behavior which sometimes appears and is hostile to us.

As Asians look at the West from these attitudes, and particularly as they view the United States, there is a tendency for many of them to interpret present United States policies as a policy of force. To them we exaggerate the value of force.

And they identify force with the era of foreign domination in Asia against which present Asian nationalism rebels. When we announce a policy of massive retaliation it places force in the forefront rather than in the position of an ultimate recourse where it should rightly be. In the minds of many people throughout Asia our emphasis on force rules out of the foreground the normal and accepted processes of negotiation in human relations. It undermines our dignity and our prestige. For the mightiest power on the face of the earth to flaunt its strength in this manner is readily interpreted in Asia in the light of a man who threatens to shoot his neighbor if the latter's cow comes into his pasture rather than to discuss the problem of mending the fence. To be sure, the reactions vary in different parts of Asia, but I think it is correct to say that Asians in general, including the Chinese people—in spite of the recent actions of their rulers—are a peaceful people and they tend to admire the strong who are also peaceful. Much of the great respect which this country enjoyed in the past derived from that fact. President Theodore Roosevelt's admonition to "speak softly but carry a big stick" won us a great backlog of good will in Asia. This sensible advice seems to have been forgotten by a great number of Americans who otherwise have every cause to admire Theodore Roosevelt.

Those who know the peoples of Asia can attest to the great emphasis which they place on negotiation. A spirit of negotiation permeates their everyday life; it involves adjustments and give-and-take and inevitably is accompanied by prolonged discussion. Those who know Asia will also attest to the

lack of the visible use of force in the everyday relations among Asians.

Closely related is a concept found in many parts of Asia which in effect holds that there is a positive force in a negative action. We see this in the philosophy of Chinese Taoism—we see it in what often appears to us to be the retiring or reticent traits of many Asian peoples—we see it in the Chinese concept employed even by the Chinese Communists, of "advancing by withdrawing"—we have seen it in India in the passive resistance doctrine of Mahatma Gandhi. It is reflected now in the arguments of the Asian neutrals. We see it in the jujitsu sport and the doctrine of judo in Japan in which one utilizes the offensive force of his opponent to his own advantage. There are, of course, counterdoctrines in Asia which place great emphasis on force, and we should not forget them, but examples serve to illustrate an attitude which is of the highest importance in understanding the international policies of the Asian nations.

The mention of the possible use of atomic tactical weapons in the defense of Formosa is often interpreted there as further evidence of United States reliance on force. Instead of enhancing the strength of our position it has the effect of an admission that we are incapable of coping with the situation on a plane of reason and have been driven in the first round to dependence upon an ultimate recourse.

If there is any one factor responsible for disagreement in our relations with India, Burma, Indonesia, and Ceylon it is the view of their leaders that primary reliance on force is not the best means of gaining solutions in Asia.

They advance the view that we can prevent Communist aggression but in preventing the aggression it is not necessary to exercise pressures which rule out a climate of negotiation. We may find this attitude unrealistic and in some cases, I believe, correctly so. What is important, however, is to recognize its existence and, if we are not intent upon isolating ourselves, to accommodate our policies, wherever possible, to it. There is no sense in getting furious about it or losing our temper over it. To do so may give us a momentary sense of satisfaction but it is not going to serve our national interests.

Most Asian nations acquiesced in the action of the United States in neutralizing the Formosa Strait at the beginning of the Korean war. At the beginning of 1953, however, neutralization was replaced by a boastful policy of unleashing the Chinese nationalist forces. With few exceptions this second step was interpreted by the free states of Asia as provocative—as putting the United States in position of reliance on force to the exclusion of other means.

What then should be the role of force in our policy in Asia? We know that in all realism no great power, least of all the United States, can afford at present to abandon or weaken its military power. We must continue the system of military alliances in the western Pacific, southeast Asia, and the Near East.

Let us by all means continue to maintain and strengthen our military defenses in the Far East. Is it not, however, in the interest of peace in Asia, and in our own national interest, that we relegate the use of force to the background? Is it not in our interest to explore measures which offer some hope of leading to long-term solutions? Are there measures which will obtain these solutions? I believe there are.

As a first measure it seems to me essential that we keep clearly in mind that our national interest in the Formosan area is the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores not that of the offshore islands of the Quemoy and the Matsus. Any defense of the coastal islands, which always have been a part of

China and so involved in the Chinese civil war is incidental to our primary aim. President Eisenhower, in submitting the Formosa resolution to Congress, only hinted at a possible defense of the coastal islands while urging that a cease-fire be negotiated. That should remain our immediate objective and there are signs now that we may be moving toward its achievement.

We cannot fail to recognize in this situation that threats to peace are posed by the Chinese on both sides of the Formosa Straits. The Republic of China on Formosa has repeatedly avowed its intention of regaining the mainland. The United States must come to grips with that threat since we are linked in a defense alliance with the Republic. Assuming that liberation of the mainland by force were militarily feasible—and it is not even conceivable short of committing this country to an all-out war on the Continent of Asia—would the people of the United States support the use of force as an instrument of national policy for the liberation of China? I think not. Is it beyond our imagination to conceive of China being ultimately freed from totalitarian communism by other means? Have we so little faith in the power of freedom? The Chinese people have turned out their oppressors many times. Is it inconceivable that they will not do so again?

The National Government of China deserves every reasonable consideration from this country. First consideration must be given, however, to our national needs and our needs are not served by an embroilment in a war to liberate the Chinese mainland. I think it is time to recognize the tragic blunder of unleashing Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and building up his expectations that we would return him to the mainland. That was a cruel and misleading thing to do and I think we ought to acknowledge the error. I do not think we ought to compound it.

Once we have returned to the policy of neutralization, the policy adopted in 1950, we will have laid the groundwork for international action to counter the threat of the Chinese Communists.

The United States can then and only then, on sound moral and legal grounds, insist that other free nations join with us in opposition to the use of any aggressive force in the Formosa area. Such a declaration made perhaps by the United Nations Assembly could call on both the Chinese Communists and the Nationalists to abstain from the use of force. Once our own purposes are clear, I believe that many, if not most countries outside the Communist bloc would support a declaration condemning an attack by either side in the Chinese conflict. Such a declaration would unite those nations who now oppose Communist military action against Formosa but who are unwilling to give either moral or actual support to the defense of the island so long as the Chinese National Government continues to threaten to invade the mainland. Such a declaration having been made, the question of the defense of the coastal islands would become a question for international determination. It would no longer be a responsibility for the President of the United States alone. By taking this action the peoples of Asia would be given a clear and forthright commitment that our position respecting Formosa involved resort to force not in a trigger-happy fashion but force as a last recourse. At the same time, we would not have budged 1 inch in our determination to prevent Communist seizure of Formosa.

Neutralization of the Straits, however important, is only a first positive step toward a solution of the problem of Formosa. A determination of the status of Formosa is complicated not only by questions of international law but by considerations contained in the regrettable but realistic fact that the

Republic of China on Formosa is not now and short of total war has little hope of becoming the government of the mainland of China. So long as two Chinese governments, one on Formosa and one on the mainland claim jurisdiction over all of China, there exists not only civil war but a threat to world peace—the seeds of total war.

A number of possible solutions to this problem have been advanced. The establishment of an independent republic on Formosa by declaration of the present government would be realistic but is not a likely development. A plebiscite of the people of Formosa has been suggested to determine their wishes in this matter. Further proposals have been made to the effect that Formosa be placed under a trusteeship with its integrity guaranteed for a designated period of years. These envisage a trusteeship either by a single Pacific nation, by a consortium of powers or by the United Nations. In addition to these proposals there are undoubtedly solutions as yet unexplored. All such proposals require patient and thorough examination.

A settlement of the status of Formosa would permit our full energies to be directed toward the many problems of our peaceful relations with the Asian nations. For many years now we have thought of the world as being divided into two parts—the free world and the Communist world. These words have become a part of our everyday language. Yet we are now coming to recognize the width and depth of the chasm which exists within the free world. There is a gulf which may be of greater long-range significance than the immediate threat of communism. In terms of economics the gulf is between those states which have a high material standard of living and those which are struggling to rise from the level of recurrent famine; it is an abyss which separates automation from the man-drawn plow.

It is not enough that we build a wall to contain communism, for while we build the wall the chasms within the free world deepen. I am suggesting that we continue to maintain our defense system in the Far East but that in the foreground our energy and intellect and resources be directed toward building bridges across the chasms in the free world.

It will take more than what we now call technical assistance and economic aid. If the gap is to be bridged the concept of "aid" must be replaced by a unity of purpose. The challenge is to move into spheres of economic and cultural cooperation in which the common progress of all free nations becomes possible. If we are equal to that challenge, and if we have the patience and understanding to stay with it, we need have no fear of the outcome of this contest between totalitarian communism and freedom—in Asia, in Europe or anywhere else.

Vital Technical Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him regarding technical-assistance programs abroad, together with an editorial, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Our technical-assistance programs abroad take on their most importance when we find private United States industries willing to participate with skilled personnel.

One example of this kind of cooperation comes to me through an editorial carried in the Seattle Times of Thursday, May 19, entitled "Doing Unto Others," which I present for printing in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

"DOING UNTO OTHERS"

"Deliberations at the recent Bandung Conference convinced the world—including Soviet Russia—that leaders of most of the remaining free Asian countries are strongly anti-Communist. It is a matter of the first importance that the United States encourage these peoples in sustaining that attitude, and to help them in preserving their free economy.

"Technical assistance is one means to the accomplishment of these ends. This has been recognized in a project undertaken by Pan American World Airways in Pakistan, in cooperation with the United States Foreign Operations Administration and Pakistan International Airways.

"In the first Government technical-assistance program to use aviation to stimulate the economic and industrial growth of an undeveloped area, Pan American will provide a team of 24 experts for 3 years to train Pakistanis in the modern techniques of airline operations.

"Development of aviation in Pakistan is peculiarly important because Pakistan is divided into two areas, 1,400 miles apart. Nothing could be more useful to the advancement and unity of this young nation than establishment of stable, independent communications between its two widely separated sections."

Completion of Great Lakes Connecting Channels: The Story of Accomplishment Under the Wiley Seaway Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my hope that before the end of this session of Congress, a bill will have been passed to authorize final action to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels. If that shall be done, the 30-year-old fight for the deep water Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway will have been brought to a completely successful conclusion.

There is now pending on both the Senate and House sides legislation to deepen these connecting channels—to a uniform controlling depth of 27 feet.

The first bill offered on the Senate side for this purpose was S. 171, by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

It is most fitting and appropriate that action be taken on his initiative, in view of the fact that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway law itself, Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress, bears his name—the Wiley law.

It is often said that some segments of the public may tend to forget some of the accomplishments of their legislators in the Congress. I believe, however, that the fine record with respect to the St. Lawrence Seaway should not be forgotten by the people of our country. In particular, it should not be forgotten by the people of Wisconsin, who, like the other Lake States, will reap tremendous dividends from the seaway down through the years.

I have before me now a compilation of the various comments which have been made over a period of time by our colleagues regarding the contributions made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin. Except in the instances where noted, these statements were originally made in the May 7, 1954, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following the final passage of the seaway bill by this body.

I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a fitting reminder of what was in effect the first anniversary of the Wiley law a few weeks ago—a law generally regarded as the greatest single milestone in the history of the Lake States in this century.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENDATIONS OF SENATOR WILEY

Senator KNOWLAND, California, Senate Republican leader, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"I should not want this opportunity to pass without paying my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. WILEY. Over a period of a great many years he has diligently worked for the enactment of this legislation. It has been a rather heartbreaking job over the years, because of the obstacles of one type or another which have been thrown in the way."

Senator DIRKSEN, Illinois, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"So, Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the man who has so consistently sat upon and hatched the ideal that has at last come into fruition in the legislative measure about to be acted on finally by the Senate. I pay tribute to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY. His great humility and fine self-effacement have, of course, caused him to omit mentioning his own name. However, all his colleagues pay testimony to the persistence, vigor, and great vision with which he has pursued this great cause. Today we salute him for his victory in connection with this great ideal."

Senator POTTER, Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the leadership shown by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, throughout the work on this momentous piece of legislation.

"This is the first Congress in which the bill has received favorable consideration by either House of Congress. I wish to join the other Senators who have spoken in expressing my appreciation for the leadership shown by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

"So, Mr. President, this occasion is a momentous one which the people of the great Midwest will cherish for many, many years to come."

Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I cannot help notice how much joy and happiness there is in this Chamber. In victory there is great joy.

There is today no Member of the Senate who deserves to feel a sense of accomplishment and fulfillment of purpose more than the Senator from Wisconsin.

"I was highly honored to be privileged, through the good advice of the Senator from Wisconsin, of being a cosponsor of S. 2150." Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding a word of commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin and the other Senators who joined him in bringing about the fulfillment of the long-time dream of a St. Lawrence River Seaway.

"The senior Senator from Wisconsin has exercised a great deal of statesmanship in bringing together the Senators and the interests of various sections of the country and finally accomplishing the passage of the proposed legislation."

Senator SMITH, New Jersey, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"ALEX WILEY, my pal on the Foreign Relations Committee, has worked strenuously in connection with this legislation."

Senator FERGUSON, Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this subject in praise of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. At times it can be said that, after all is said and done, there is more said than done. I believe this is an exception. The exception is that, in this instance, we have finally done more than we said."

Senator LEHMAN, New York, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I take great pleasure and satisfaction in congratulating the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, on the final enactment by both Houses of Congress of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill.

"I wish to express my satisfaction and appreciation for the efforts of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. Without his interest, without his determination, and without his continued agitation for this legislation, particularly after he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the final enactment of the bill would have been impossible."

Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"I think that at long last we are nearing the final step in the legislative history of the St. Lawrence Seaway proposal."

"I should like to add a word of congratulation to the eminent chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the part which he has played in securing the passage of the bill. As a somewhat junior Member of the Senate, I have watched his very effective work, not only in committee and on the floor, but off the floor; and I would say that his has been perhaps the greatest effort toward getting the bill passed. We of the Midwest owe a debt to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am sure the citizens of his State are grateful.

"I want to express the appreciation of the members of all parties for the very effective and untiring work which the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has devoted to this task."

Senator CASE, South Dakota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 4, 1954:

"The remarks of the senior Senator from Wisconsin remind me that the present favorable position for the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill is due in large part to his persistence and effective leadership and sponsorship of that measure. I hope the bill will be passed as a further tribute to the work of the Senator from Wisconsin."

Senator CASE, South Dakota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"The present favorable position for the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill is due, in large part, to his persistent and effective leadership and sponsorship of that measure. I hope the bill will be passed by the House and approved by the President promptly, as a further tribute to the work of the Senator from Wisconsin, as well as a gesture, a very appropriate gesture at this time, of our comradeship with the people of Canada."

Senator AIKEN, Vermont, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Next, let me say that for the past 2 years it has been a great pleasure to be a co-sponsor of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, under the able, sincere, and enthusiastic leadership of the senior Senator from Wisconsin."

Senator COOPER, Kentucky, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing admiration for the successful fight which the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, has made in connection with the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill."

"It was the long-continued insistence and the fine and convincing arguments of my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, which removed any doubt I may have had about the bill. I congratulate him for the successful outcome of his efforts in connection with the great St. Lawrence River project."

Senator THYE, Minnesota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, when I came to Washington I found such Members as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, working vigorously to accomplish the development of the seaway."

Senator THYE, Minnesota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 17, 1954:

"Mr. President, I was pleased to see that a great many of the newspapers of Wisconsin commended the great contributions made by our colleague, the senior Senator from the Badger State, Mr. WILEY, in achieving the passage of the Wiley bill, S. 2150, to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway."

Senator CORDON, Oregon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 25, 1954:

"Mr. President, I have been glad to note that the newspapers of Wisconsin have given well-deserved credit to the senior Senator from that State, Mr. WILEY, for his valiant and successful sponsorship of the St. Lawrence Seaway law."

"I ask unanimous consent that several editorials which have appeared in Wisconsin papers be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

[From the Two Rivers Reporter of May 10, 1954]

SEAWAY AT LONG LAST

There was general jubilation expressed by people in the community about the seaway after the House last week had approved the measure, thus ending more than 40 years of anxious waiting.

The seaway represents a triumph for the administration, being actively supported by President Eisenhower. However, no man deserves more credit for the success of the project than Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. It was he who, more than any other legislator, worked unflaggingly to engineer the undertaking through both Houses.

While Senator WILEY was, of course, thinking of benefits for his State, he was nonetheless an exponent of the seaway for the Midwest and the Nation as a whole. He wanted the United States to have a voice in it with Canada, since that country was determined to build with or without the United States.

His efforts have borne preliminary rich fruit, and there are confident predictions he will watch the entire country bear even richer results in the years ahead when the seaway becomes a reality. The St. Lawrence Seaway may someday stand as a monument to a man who would not admit defeat so the entire country would benefit.

[From the Sturgeon Bay Advocate of May 11, 1954]

OUR MAYOR SAYS

(By Mayor Stanley R. Greene)

THE WILEY BILL

After many years of struggle it now appears as though a jointly sponsored United States-Canadian Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway will become a reality.

The bill that makes the seaway a reality will be signed this week by President Eisenhower. The bill was sponsored by Senator WILEY and has become generally known as the Wiley bill. Senator WILEY in his efforts on behalf of the bill has displayed genuine statesmanship in the service of both his country and the State which he represents in the Senate.

Both senatorial Democrats and Republicans recognized this fact and paid the Senator an unusual tribute in recognition of those services.

[From the Chilton Times-Journal of May 13, 1954]

PASSAGE OF SEAWAY BILL A MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT

The passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill after 59 years of bickering is a real achievement for the Eisenhower administration.

Wisconsin's Senator WILEY played a leading role in getting the measure past the stiff obstacles interposed in the Senate.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald of May 10, 1954]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Whatever the Republican administration in Washington may accomplish, its success in winning congressional approval of the St. Lawrence Seaway will stand out as one of its great achievements.

Wisconsin's Representatives and Senators, it may be noted, were in unanimous support of the legislation, but special credit belongs to Senator WILEY who sponsored the seaway proposal in the Senate and played a leading role in obtaining its passage.

[From the Burlington Standard-Democrat of May 13, 1954]

HIS WORK PAID OFF

Our congratulations to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY for his successful labors toward the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Our Wisconsin senior Senator worked hard for this State for many years, being the only man, at times, who would stand up and be counted.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of May 10, 1954]

A VICTORY FOR WISCONSIN

Wisconsin and the Midwest won what we believe is an important economic victory last week with passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill. It should go to President Eisenhower, who favors it, soon.

This State can be proud of its many hard-to-lick citizens, public and private, who have fought for the seaway for more than 20 years.

In that category must be included Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

It was WILEY, perhaps more than any other individual, who kept the seaway issue alive during its darkest days.

[From the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune of May 12, 1954]

WILEY AND THE SEAWAY

Principal spokesman for the administration in steering the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation to final enactment was Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. He led the fight in a manner which gained for him the admiration and respect of all his colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, regardless of whether they favored or opposed the project. He deserves a great part of the credit for bringing the seaway close to realization. Wisconsin should be proud to acknowledge his splendid work and thank him for it.

[From the La Crosse Tribune of May 6, 1954]

For his leadership in winning Senate approval of the St. Lawrence Seaway alone, Senator WILEY is deserving of the plaudits of this State, and most of all by the Republican Party.

From his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has been outspoken in his support of President Eisenhower all down the line. The respect he has earned from his Republican colleagues in the Senate as a result is as enduring as are his achievements.

Whatever support and commendation flows to President Eisenhower for his position in international affairs—and properly a great deal has from Republican sources—must in all fairness inure to Senator WILEY as well.

[From the Eau Claire Leader-Telegram of May 9, 1954]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY GETS UNITED STATES BACKING

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Chippewa Falls, has been in the forefront of seaway battles during his three terms as United States Senator and it is fitting that the legislation finally passed bears his name—the Wiley-Dondero bill. WILEY led the fight in the Senate and Representative DONDERO, Michigan Republican, was floor manager of pro-seaway forces in the House.

Mr. Charles E. Broughton, station WHBL, Sheboygan, Wis.:

"We want to commend Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who, lonehanded, out here in Wisconsin, has continued his fight. He has never wavered in that respect and it must be a great source of pleasure for him to know that the fight looks more encouraging than ever."

FROM SENATORIAL OPPONENTS

Senator BRALL, Maryland, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, as a member of the opposition, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the tremendous job he has done."

"I think the Senator from Wisconsin is to be congratulated for his generalship in the handling of parliamentary matters in connection with the bill. I cannot refrain from congratulating the Senator from Wisconsin on his victory today."

Senator BUTLER, Maryland, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"May I say that I congratulate my very worthy adversary, the Senator from Wisconsin, not only on behalf of myself but of others who participated in the opposition."

Senator STENNIS, Mississippi, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"I recall that when I first came to the Senate, more than 6 years ago, the Senator from Wisconsin was working on a bill on the same subject matter. He has spoken on this subject many times since then, always with great sincerity, earnestness, and persuasion. I know he has worked very persistently for the bill, both among his colleagues in the Senate and elsewhere."

"As one who did not vote for the bill, I wish to commend him very highly.

"I feel that at times his work made the difference between abandoning the bill and continuing with it. I salute and congratulate him on his fine achievement, which I know will prove to be most worth while for a great many people, even beyond his own State."

MAY 25, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations on your wonderful work in getting through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

You have had your teeth in this matter for many years and it has been your persistence and your statesmanship that has brought about the results.

I congratulate you and your State.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

Can Mankind Endure Half Slave and Half Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege yesterday to deliver an address in Bement, Ill., the place where Lincoln and Douglas met to arrange the time and place of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, which took place 100 years ago. I spoke on the subject, Can Mankind Endure Half Slave and Half Free?

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN MANKIND ENDURE HALF SLAVE AND HALF FREE?

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE: FREEDOM AND SURVIVAL WITHOUT GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR

I am pleased to be present at the inauguration of this Town Meeting series on a site which holds such deep meaning to the people of our country.

The tradition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates is one of the historic hallmarks of American political life.

No single series of political exchanges have marked themselves so indelibly in the memory of the American people.

Here was a great period in American history—the stormy period preceding the War Between the States.

Here were two masterful figures in American life, notably the man who was to become the Great Emancipator and Douglas the Little Giant. And here was a great issue being debated in the American manner—with sincerity, with openness, with candor before the bar of public opinion—without mudslinging and personalities.

Abe Lincoln didn't go thereafter to the Senate, but he did later go to the White House and he did become enshrined in mankind's heart.

May we be worthy of his everlasting inspiration.

Today we turn to another great historic issue.

Today I address myself to the vital question: Can mankind endure half slave and half free?

OUR ANSWER AND NECESSARY RESERVATIONS

I believe that the answer to that question is "Yes," but with certain reservations.

"Yes," if we are vigilant; "Yes," if we are strong. The answer is "Yes" if we definitely do not—I repeat if we do not—give moral sanction—moral approval to Communist slavery simply because it is entrenched, even though we reject war as a means of abolishing that slavery.

The answer is "Yes," in summary, if we remain true to our own ideals—to Lincoln's ideals. He wanted to save the Union. We want to save the Union—with strength, but without war, if it can possibly be avoided.

As you can see, as in the case of most important questions, we must bear in mind a great many factors on the world scene, a great many necessary reservations.

AMERICANS REJECT SLAVERY IN ANY FORM

In the first place, let it be stated emphatically that the United States rejects the institution of human slavery today, just as we rejected it almost a century ago on the field of battle, even when brother had to fight brother on this continent in 4 bloody years of Civil War.

Ours is a moral people. We live by the moral law.

We know that slavery, whether it be the slavery based on the color of a man's skin, or the class-slavery imposed by a Communist dictatorship, utterly outrages the conscience of mankind.

WE CAN NEVER BE SILENT ABOUT SLAVERY

We will never be silent in the face of slavery.

Abraham Lincoln pointed out in the course of his great career, that to be silent in the face of evil is to take part in that evil.

We cannot be silent, therefore, before the slavery of Eastern Europe. We cannot—must not—ignore the suffering of the Russian people themselves who, since November 1917 have been shackled under the cruelest despotism in the history of the earth. We cannot ignore the plight of the 550 million people of China, mercilessly tyrannized by the despotic clique of Peking. We cannot ignore the plight of the suffering people of North Korea, nor that of the unfortunate population of Communist-controlled northern Vietnam.

Wherever there is slavery, that is where the conscience of America asks for freedom.

As once, the North could not ignore the moans and suffering of the enslaved Negroes of the South, so today, the peoples of the free world hear the moans and groans from the concentration camps of Siberia, the forced labor camps everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. We can see in our mind's eye the persecution the suffering, the torment of the enslaved hundreds of millions.

We will never acquiesce to their permanent enslavement.

As a matter of fact, we oppose slavery in every shape, manner or form—political slavery; economic slavery, intellectual slavery; military slavery.

We oppose the principle of colonialism. We ourselves emerged to independence through the fortitude of 13 colonies which appealed to the conscience of mankind in our own Declaration of Independence.

OPPOSING SYSTEMS HAVE CO-EXISTED IN THE PAST

Now, the second factor to keep in mind is that all of history is full of instances where opposing systems did exist side by side in relative peace.

It may have been uneasy peace—a peace occasionally broken—but it was peace, nonetheless. Opposing religions learned to live

alongside one another, even though but a few centuries ago two of the great religions of Western civilization were relentlessly engaged in the bitterest type of national and civil wars.

Men of these two great faiths literally burned each other at the stake in the mistaken notion that they were performing God's will. But today, the great Christian faiths have learned to live in peace with one another and in harmony and in so doing have learned religion.

So, too, history is full of the record of rival economic systems which contested with one another and which nevertheless managed to live in a relative state of peace.

The great historian, Arnold Toynbee, has constantly reemphasized and documented this point; that opposing systems have learned to live with one another—whether it be Christianity with Islam or feudalism with capitalism, or republicanism with monarchy.

If contrasting systems can coexist and have coexisted, wherein arises the current problem?

THE IMPERIALIST NATURE OF WORLD COMMUNISM

The problem arises from the third factor. That factor is, of course, the aggressive imperialist nature of international communism.

The current situation exists not because we want to conquer the world. On the contrary, we desire that all men shall freely work out their own destiny in their own way.

We hope that they will work it out in a manner of freedom. We hope that they will recognize the light of limited power—of separation of powers—which has come from this Republic and from other beacons of freedom.

We are proud of our way, but we do not want to impose our way on others. We know that mankind is stratified today, with parts of the human race at different levels—economically, socially, politically, culturally, religiously and otherwise. We do not want to "make over the world in America's image," though we believe it would be good for the world.

But the Kremlin does want to make over the world in the Kremlin's ugly image.

It is the Kremlin which for 37 years in callous violation of its pledges, has been engaged in above-the-ground and under-the-ground conspiracy.

It is the Kremlin which has constructed the most diabolic Trojan horse movement in history, using internal armies of saboteurs, seditionists, traitors, and others to destroy nations from within.

It is the Kremlin which insists in accordance with its Marxist dogma, that the world must be all Communist or else "the capitalists will take it over."

LENIN-STALIN QUOTATIONS ON CONFLICT

Listen to these quotations:

"* * * The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and bourgeois states will be inevitable."

"As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

"We must say that either those who wanted to cause our destruction must perish, those who think we must perish—and in that case our Soviet Republic will live—or the capitalist will live and in that case the Republic will perish."

Who said that? Nikolai Lenin.

"Who will conquer whom? That is the whole question * * * The world is divided into two camps."

Who said that? Joseph Stalin.

Have those militarist dogmas been repudiated by the Kremlin—in fact and in deed? Definitely not.

Therein lies the challenge to the free world.

That, then, is the third factor: the merciless intention of the Kremlin to control the world, an intention which has not been fundamentally changed in spite of the so-called Soviet "peace offensive," now in full blast.

THE TERRIBLE NATURE OF A THIRD WAR

But now we come to the fourth factor in answer to our question. We ask again, "Can mankind endure half slave and half free?"

And the answer is that mankind must—learn to endure the present division without resorting, if at all possible, to force of arms.

Why? Because the nature of modern superweapons is such that a third world war could be a thing of utter horror to mankind. A third world war would leave not victor and vanquished, but 2 rubble heaps, 2 charred continents or more, of radioactive ashes, where once there were cities and farms.

One side might be less destroyed than the other, but the victory would be barren indeed.

And what conditions would follow such a so-called victory? Would the world be freer, more prosperous, happier? Of course not. Would all slavery be ended? Probably not. Chaos and disaster breed only more problems. So, this evil legacy of a third world war—a nuclear Armageddon—could continue for a period of further time that no man now living could measure.

To talk lightly of the possibility of war is, therefore, an act of highest irresponsibility. To engage loosely in hurling ultimatums, in blustering threats from one side or the other, is inexcusable.

Somehow, no matter how serious the crisis, we must find peaceful means to try to settle it. This does not mean appeasement, because we know appeasement is self-defeating.

But it does mean exhausting every last alternative in every last situation in the interest of peace.

Too many Americans lose patience too soon. Too many Americans are too willing to throw up their hands in dismay, and to ask for final action.

THE DANGERS OF ARBITRARY ACTION OVER UNITED STATES AIRMEN

When the Peking government outrageously imprisoned United States airmen, the suggestion was made that we unilaterally hurl an ultimatum with an early, fixed deadline; that we ignore the contrary opinion of the United Nations; that we, if necessary, unilaterally impose a blockade against Red China.

Such a blockade could have meant the death of the very airmen we have been trying to save. It could have meant the starting of a chain reaction which might conceivably have led to world war III.

The motives of those Americans who made the suggestion were high and patriotic. Their zeal in the defense of American nationals was understandable, and commendable; no one would quarrel with their deep feeling for our imprisoned countrymen.

But we who disagreed did have a legitimate case against what was, in effect, loose suggestions whose ominous consequences had not been sufficiently thought out.

Now, there will be more crises to come in the future. Each year will offer new challenges, new pitfalls, new dangers.

Soviet tactics, now relatively soft, may return to the belligerent Stalinist line overnight.

We cannot pierce the veil of the future, nor for that matter can even the leaders of the Kremlin today. Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Zhukov themselves do not know if they will be in power tomorrow, and how the

trend of world events may shape their own thinking and action.

But as for ourselves, we must go ahead with courage, with confidence, and with faith—with readiness to fight, if need be, but with determination to avoid fighting, if possible, and with honor, with justice.

The forthcoming meeting at San Francisco on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter offers real possibilities for new exploration by the foreign ministers of East-West problems.

The meeting at the summit which will follow thereafter, possibly in late July, offers still more possibilities for some progress in resolving East-West tensions.

But no single meeting, at San Francisco, or Lausanne or anywhere else, will solve the basic problem.

In 10 years, we have literally had tens of thousands of meetings with Soviet negotiators on hundreds of issues, and we know the pitfalls of negotiating with them.

We recall how time after time they cruelly disappointed the hopes of the world; how they build some of us up for "an awful let-down."

This time, we are wary. This time we are not "oversold" on the possibilities of successful negotiations. But neither should we allow our hope and confidence to fade so that we become filled with fear or doubt or anxiety.

AMERICA'S MAGNIFICENT RECORD OF GENEROSITY

We have seen the heights to which men could rise to win a war, and we have seen the heights to which men could rise in peace.

This Nation rose magnificently to the challenge of World War II and the Korean conflict. It rose just as magnificently to the challenge of healing the wounds of World War II.

The aid program which the people of the United States generously extended—through the Marshall plan, through point 4, through Mutual Security is one of the great chapters in the history of mankind.

It is a chapter now being supplemented by the sound Mutual Security bill for the fiscal year 1956, which is now reaching its final stages in the current session of the Congress.

TO THE VICTOR BELONGS THE RESPONSIBILITY

I recall the words of a great statesman, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. Dr. Adenauer stated that in every war when the German people were victorious, they applied the rule that "to the victor belonged the spoils."

He said they had expected that same rule would be applied when American occupation troops entered defeated West Germany. "We waited," said this great German statesman, "days, weeks, months, years. We were astonished," said he, "to see that the American people applied a totally new historic formula. And that formula was: That to the victor belongs the responsibility, the job of helping to rebuild, to reconstruct, to heal wounds."

We have helped to restore West Germany to the family of nations. And the German people, a great people, has industriously risen to the challenge, has come back with economic vitality and political strength and courage.

The people of West Germany are overwhelmingly anti-Communist. And their enslaved fellow nationals of East Germany would likewise vote overwhelmingly anti-Communist if they are ever given a real chance to do so.

The people of West Germany are irrevocably a part of the Western Alliance. They will not fall for the seductive lure of so-called neutrality, in return for unification. They know that neutrality for West Germany could be suicide for West Germany and

could contribute to fatal weakness for the West.

Over on the other side of the world, another former enemy nation has likewise come back with vigor and determination. The people of Japan, a conscientious, hard-working, able, alert people have been responding to the challenge which is theirs. They, too, will not fall for the siren song of the Communist betrayers.

The Communists would like to see Japan remain a military vacuum, just as they would like to see West Germany remain a military vacuum. The Red plan must and will fall on both sides of the world.

ASIA IN FERMENT OF IDEAS

Meanwhile, freemen in other areas of the world are coming to a rebirth. There is ferment throughout the vast arc of free Asia and throughout Africa as well. Underdeveloped peoples are coming into their own. Peoples are rising from age-old conditions of poverty, malnutrition, disease. The progress may seem slow, but everywhere there is ferment in the East—a search for sound ideas—and they are finding them.

Just a few days ago, I had the privilege of hearing one of the great spokesmen of free Asia, one of the fine leaders of the free world—Gen. Carlos Romulo, former president of the United Nations General Assembly. He told the story of the Bandung Conference. He told how free Asia is filled, not as we have been mistakenly told with enmity for America, but with a great reservoir of friendship for us.

To be sure, the Communist firebrands are seeking to ignite more flames of nationalism and racialism against us. But free Asia is not being fooled. And the Bandung Conference proved that we have great and good friends among other peoples who are still in colonial status, as well as the peoples who have emerged to full sovereignty or the people like the Thais who have been free. The Philippines, Pakistan—we hail their contributions. Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia—we welcome the opportunity to work with them for a brighter era for all.

SINCERE RESPECT FOR INDIA'S NEHRU

And while I am in this area, I say that in spite of our often wide differences with a distinguished leader like India's Prime Minister Nehru, there is every good reason to work with him for peace on the continued basis of sincere, cordial, deep respect. He is a great leader of a great people; an eloquent, earnest, dedicated, democratic leader.

I have no time for ill-tempered Americans who go "off the beam," completely exasperated because of our differences with Prime Minister Nehru, just as I hope thinking Indians will have no time for Indians who exaggerate and aggravate our differences. Let us narrow our area of disagreement instead of widening it. And let us note that on a great many occasions, Mr. Nehru has been outstandingly effective in serving the cause of freedom throughout the world. I hope and believe there will be many more such occasions in the future.

The peoples of the underdeveloped areas are, as I have indicated, coming into their own. Our hand of friendship remains gladly extended to them—to all of them, I add.

WE HAVE TENDED TO ACT TOO MUCH BY REFLEX

They want to hear from us a positive, constructive, imaginative program. We must not simply wait for crises to develop. We have tended far too long to simply act by delayed reflex.

The Soviet challenges the free world in place A; the free world then responds in place A. The Soviets challenge us in place B; we respond in place B. It is the Reds who have been picking the time and place of contest. Yet, we know that it is poor strategy for us always to allow the enemy to choose the field and timing of contest.

Moreover, it is definitely not enough for us to offer anticommunism alone as a program to the world. While it is up to us to get across the danger of communism in all its savage barbarism, other peoples of the world, particularly underdeveloped peoples, are not going to respond to a negative program on our part. They want affirmative hope in the future. They want specific and constructive suggestions and assistance. We cannot, of course, do for them what they should be doing for themselves. But neither should we keep accentuating the negative—what we are against—instead of what we are for.

THE TRUE NATURE OF FREEDOM

Now, my friends, I would not want us to leave this occasion with a narrow concept of the fundamental idea of freedom itself.

Freedom is simply not a matter alone of the formal traditions of freedom which we have known—freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of employment, freedom to own property—great as these blessings are. Freedom is basically a spiritual thing.

There have been great men and women who have literally been slaves in the sense that they have been the chattel of others. And yet they have been free.

Why? Because their minds have been free. Their spirits have been free.

You cannot shackle the human spirit, as you can the human flesh.

There have been people who are free, and yet who are slaves in the sense that they have sold their spiritual birthright for a mess of material pottage.

On the other hand, there are men and women living in abject poverty today who are free and who enjoy riches that the wealthiest man, enslaved by the lust for power or money, does not know. The poor man who is free in spirit can scale heights which the man enslaved by greed can never mount.

Nobility of mind makes men free; clearness of vision to what is real, what is lasting, what is truly good—the things of the Spirit.

What matter if Abraham Lincoln never had wealth? What matter if he never completely rose from poverty but constantly lived with meager resources? He was a free man. He was a man whose spirit could not be downed. Why? Because he drew upon the Eternal Spirit: the all-knowing, the all-present, all-seeing Creator when difficulties mounted for him.

The poet said: "He is the free man who the truth makes free—and all are slaves besides."

The people behind the Iron Curtain may be chained in bondage, but not even the cruellest master of the Arctic forced labor camps can quench the fire of freedom which burns in the human breast, nor the spirit of man which material power alone can never wreck.

Abraham Lincoln had said, "I believe that this Government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free." He was right, human beings are not property—to be bought and sold, and no society should endure on that basis.

OUR ANSWER TO THE BASIC QUESTION

So, today, we answer the basic question before us by saying: May all this world one day be free. Toward that end, we pledge our best efforts in peace and in justice.

And too, we state emphatically, we reject all despair that the Soviet Empire will last indefinitely. Rather, we believe that empire is subject to terrific internal stresses and strains which may one day rend it asunder from within and thus permit the subject peoples to regain their freedom—for the Spirit that makes free is abroad in the world, even in Russia.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it has been a great joy to be with you today, and I hope that this

forum series will produce the type of food for thought, food for mental stimulation and progress and for national and international progress and stimulus which were the fruits of the great Lincoln-Douglas debates of a century ago.

Commencement Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at McDonald High School, McDonald, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a commencement address delivered by me on last Thursday, at McDonald, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE H. BENDER AT McDONALD HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION, McDONALD, OHIO, JUNE 2, 1955

I am very happy to be here with you on this wonderful occasion. Commencement time is always the most inspiring season of the year. Mothers and fathers, teachers, young men and women—you make a magnificent picture in this great country of ours. I congratulate you—and I envy you as well. Commencement is one of the best-named exercises of the school calendar. We call it commencement because we know that nothing has ended. Everything is beginning for our young people today.

It is interesting to observe the educational pattern of American life today. A generation ago, college education was relatively rare. High school was accepted as the general rule. In 1930, 12 percent of the 18-year-old young people in our country were enrolled in colleges. By 1940, the figure had jumped to 18 percent. Today, it has reached 30 percent.

I do not know if all of our young people should be going to college, but I do know that high school is a must today. Without it, young men and women find themselves almost at sea in a complicated world.

This is one of those happy occasions for looking ahead. No one ever knows what the future holds for each individual. But we do know what the future holds for your generation.

This is the most exciting period in all world history. If I had to give a name to the next decade, I would call it Opportunities Unlimited. The atomic age is already upon us. It has not yet been transported from the scientist's laboratory to the factory, but it is here.

In every field of human endeavor new pathways are being charted. Not only in the field of atomic science but also in the areas of electronics, chemistry, plastics, television, and radar. New fields are opening almost before our eyes. We have discovered that there are no limits to the human imagination. Young men and women who are interested in their fellow human beings have also made their way in every generation. Today there is a marked shortage of nurses, social workers, doctors, and teachers.

I am particularly interested in the wonderful openings for young people in the teaching area. This month, 85,000 young men and women will complete their teacher training. This is just about enough to take the place of those teachers who retire or

leave the teaching profession each year. By next September and for years to come, thousands of new students will be enrolled in our elementary schools. They will need additional thousands of teachers to train the next generation. This is a magnificent opportunity for you young people. It is something more than that for your fathers and mothers.

We know that the strength of our Republic depends upon the training which the future generation receives. Each year that I have been in Washington I have watched the boys and girls from every corner of America coming to Washington.

I read all of the stories of juvenile delinquency and I recognize the problems which they pose. Yet, as I look at the people coming to Washington, boys and girls, fathers and mothers and their grandparents, too, I cannot help thinking that America's future is still safe. I count on these fine youngsters to do their share in preserving our country for the future.

All of us in America take too much for granted. We are so accustomed to the good things of life and to our freedom, that we look with amazement at other countries that do not enjoy our liberties.

I like to tell the true story of a young girl who understands the meaning of free America better than we do ourselves. She came to my office not long ago to tell me her story. She was born in Yugoslavia under Communist control. All of her life she had been exposed to Communist propaganda. Her teachers were Communist. Her textbooks were written by Socialists. But her mother and her father were deeply religious people. Quietly, in their own way, they did their best to teach their daughter a belief in God. She understood their efforts. A few months ago she was selected as one of the top students in her secondary-school system to come to America to study dairy farming. When she arrived here she made contact with some good Americans who had come from her native village. Her mother and her father knew what she planned to do. In spite of their natural fears of what might happen, they encouraged her to make this daring escape.

She is now in the United States with a good chance of remaining here permanently. This is the greatest tribute to America that anyone can pay, to risk her life for freedom.

This freedom of ours is always called our priceless heritage. The words have been repeated so often that they have become almost meaningless. A heritage is appreciated only when it is rare. Freedom is becoming all too rare these days. Sometimes it is even frightening to look at the map. More and more places have vanished behind the Iron Curtain where freedom to worship, to think, to write, to speak, even to move about are restricted or denied entirely.

We have a duty in our own country to see that these things do not happen here.

This is the struggle of our times. All the great achievements which lie ahead of us depend upon its outcome. Atomic energy will not be used for the development of mankind unless our way of life wins this battle for the minds of men.

None of the tremendous advances just over the horizon will be realized if we blow the world to bits in a hot war. Nor will they be achieved if we allow the cold war to freeze us to death. We must go on searching for a just world peace—and a just world society.

Our job—and your job—is the exciting responsibility of building a dynamic American community. A few years ago, if someone had said that America in 1955 would produce \$357 billion worth of goods, food and services, it would have sounded ridiculous. That is what our people did last year. In another 10 years there is reason to believe that the young men and women who are being graduated all over America this month

will turn out \$500 billion in productive wealth.

This is the promise of tomorrow. Today is good enough in itself. I look to these young men and women of McDonald High School with every confidence.

They differ in their attitudes. No two of them are alike, even if they are twins. Out of this variety of minds and abilities and determination, we shall find the Presidents and poets, the physicians and farmers, the bankers and the builders, the managers and the mechanics of the future.

I congratulate you upon reaching this milestone in your lives. May it be only one more steppingstone on your road to future happiness.

Public Power—An Investment Not an Expenditure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that a statement by him and an editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

It seems incongruous to many of us sitting in this Senate that today we have to fight so hard for power projects which have returned so much to the American people in industrial power as well as actual dollars to the United States Treasury. Most of us realize—I am sure—that every new industrial plant located in an area served with power projects that we have authorized return much to the community in payrolls to the State in needed tax dollars, and to our Federal Treasury through income taxes as well as direct repayment for the construction costs.

I had this forcibly brought home to me when I read the editorial carried in the Saturday, June 4 edition of Labor, the national weekly newspaper. It comes at a time when public power is fighting for its very life; therefore, it should be of interest to every fair-minded Member of Congress and to every thinking citizen.

Thursday night I had the privilege of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding the high Federal dam we would like to see constructed at Hells Canyon, on the Snake River. This project, like the ones referred to in the Labor editorial, would further strengthen our Nation's industrial life, so vital at this time of world crisis.

I attach hereto the editorial, entitled "Public Power Pays, Yet Ike Would Strangle It," for printing in the RECORD.

[From Labor of June 4, 1955]

PUBLIC POWER PAYS, YET IKE WOULD STRANGLE IT

Two extraordinary developments this week throw glaring light on the issue of public versus private electric power. One was a report by W. A. Dexheimer, current chief of the Reclamation Service, which builds and manages most of Uncle Sam's power dams.

As Dexheimer was appointed by President Eisenhower, power trust propagandists wouldn't get far trying to label him as a "New Deal Socialist," yet here's what his report shows:

In the 50 years since the reclamation program was launched under a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, the United States Government has spent \$2.6 billion on public power projects. In return, Uncle Sam has received about \$4 billion in Federal taxes made possible by those projects and almost \$600 million electric power and water revenues. That's a total of \$4.6 billion.

Thus, the United States Treasury and the taxpayers have already recovered the entire \$2.6 billion cost, plus a \$2 billion profit. And that's just the beginning, Dexheimer points out. Most of Uncle Sam's power systems are comparatively new, and have not yet had much time to pay back their costs. In the future, the profits will be even bigger, despite the low rates charged for public power.

In addition, Dexheimer emphasizes, the power and reclamation projects are enriching the country in other ways. For example, they have raised by \$750 million a year the purchasing power of the farmers of the irrigated lands.

In the face of those facts, the private power lobby continues to shout that public power is subsidized by the taxpayers, and the drive against public power continues to get help from the Eisenhower administration. That was made clear this week by the other development.

Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Eisenhower-appointed chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Public Works Committees an extraordinary letter that the TVA's board of directors had received from the Budget Bureau, which speaks directly for the President. Vogel gave his blessing to the letter, though he admitted it does not express the views of the other two TVA board members, Raymond Paty and Harry Curtis.

That letter came on the heels of a recent TVA proposal: namely, that as a Government corporation it be given a free hand to raise money in ways other than appropriations from Congress. It asked for this authority because the seven-State TVA faces an increasing shortage of electric power and the administration refuses to ask Congress for any money to build TVA dams and new power plants.

As one way out of this impasse, the TVA proposed to sell bonds to bankers and other private investors, as well as to the United States Treasury. Also, it would have State and municipal governments and farmers' electric co-ops in the TVA area build powerplants, which would sell power to TVA, or be leased or bought by TVA over a period of years.

The Budget Bureau's letter refused to give Presidential approval to the TVA proposals, except with so many provisos and restrictions—23 in all—that the whole new financial plan would be strangled.

For example, a low limit would be put on the amount of the TVA bonds, and they could be sold only with the approval of both Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury, who is subject to Ike's orders. Also, the letter said no TVA bonds would be bought by the Treasury, but it would direct just how, when, and to whom the bonds must or must not be sold.

Among other things, the Budget Bureau put into the TVA proposal new provisions which would raise the interest rates paid on TVA bonds, and struck out of the proposal words pledging that "TVA power shall be sold at rates as low as feasible."

"The sum total of the Budget Bureau and White House Restrictions," Congressman EVINS, Democrat, Tennessee, declared, "would amount to raising TVA rates, milking the system, and creating an atmosphere whereby private power can walk in and take over."

Senator HILL, Democrat, Alabama, called the proposed restrictions "damaging to TVA." Congressman PRIEST, Democrat, Tennessee, denounced the Bureau's terms as "wholly unacceptable." Congressman DAVIS, Demo-

crat, Tennessee, declared "this is just another attempt by the administration to wreck TVA."

This conflict will soon break into the open at hearings before a House Public Works Subcommittee headed by DAVIS. Before the committee will be bills backing the original TVA financial plan, on one hand, and the administration's "strangling" plan on the other.

Meanwhile Congress might well ponder this question: Why does the White House propose to give a free financial hand to a new United States highway corporation, but insist on tying the hands of an old Government corporation, the TVA?

The Hidden Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Hidden Revolution," delivered by me at Minneapolis, Minn., on March 30, 1955, before the Conservative Citizens Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored that your young but vigorous organization has asked me to come here and talk with you about our common concern for the safety of our Nation. You are interested, as I am interested, in bringing out into the light the secret revolution which is proceeding in our country with no attempt to win the true consent of our people.

I am especially glad to discuss this issue before an organization which represents the common interests and united talents of both our political parties.

Political parties of the American type can exist only where the citizens are in basic agreement on their political ideology—what we call our Constitution. We cannot have an American two-party system except as we have a deeply held belief in both parties, that we intend to live by that Constitution. American political parties divide over different ways to meet problems, but only within the framework of our constitutional compact.

Today, we face a quite different political issue. Today's struggle is over our Constitution itself. In such a crisis, members of both old-line parties have the same interest, preservation of our basic law. Their political action is directed against a common opponent—the underminers of our Constitution, whichever party label they use to hide their true aims.

I do not question the motives of the revolutionists. Our quarrel is with their secrecy.

They propose changes in our Government which are of revolutionary force. They follow a detailed blueprint for a new and arbitrary government. Meanwhile they smile improvements which will bring our Government disarmingly and say they are asking for small merit up to date, but not alter its fundamental character at all.

No revolutionary change in the American form of government is tolerable, unless it is openly stated. No revolutionary change is honest, unless all the drastic results of the change are made perfectly clear, and time is given to Congress and the people to debate every aspect of the revolutionary turn.

Americans are fighting, under the illusion of peaceful debate, a life-and-death struggle for preservation of our form of government.

Our party system gives us no means to wage such a war. The answer is the association of members of both political parties, preferably by congressional districts. There they can work together, and support those Members of Congress who defend our Constitution, and send down to defeat any nominee of either party who permits it to be weakened.

What is the nature of this hidden revolution?

In a speech on the Bricker amendment I pointed out that this country now has a fourth house of government, in addition to the three branches established in the Constitution. I said this fourth house, the planning bureaucracy, operated as a law unto itself. It has such loose powers and such vast funds that it virtually escapes control by Congress, the President, or the courts.

The inner circle, the kitchen cabinet, and crony government, we have had before. They were bad government, but bad government under the Constitution. They did not alter the mechanics of our political system. Their successors could follow the Constitution without a new revolution.

I am going to call this group the elite, although that name does not appeal to Americans. The "elite" does not mean "the best." It refers to men who have chosen themselves as the best, and who have banded together, out of self-interest, in time of crisis, to seize power and make themselves a permanent governing class.

The significant thing about an elite is that it is a small body, self-appointed, intelligent, technically skillful, eager for power on any terms, and utterly ruthless about seizing it. The little fact Americans do not wish to face is the fact that we have been training an elite in this country for over 20 years. Under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the present administration, they have been learning how to handle the high-tension wires of big government, and hiding from us how much they have learned.

Americans dislike to study this new political force, because we have a distaste for chicanery. But we pay a heavy price for our ignorance.

Part of our confusion comes from calling this new governing elite Socialist. But socialism started as an honest attempt to raise the condition of the poor. Today's elite is not Socialist in that historic sense. The milk of human kindness has been watered very thin in the bitter struggle to hold the power they seized under cover of the great depression.

We cannot call it Communist, but this group is the ideal shelter for the Communists in our Government. We do not need to know exactly which of its members are Communist or pro-Soviet, though we shall get that information wherever we can. Regardless of how many individual members give their loyalty to the Soviet system, the work of the elite can benefit only the Soviet cause, because that is the ruling group today which best understands where it is going.

We are confused because there is no single "place," no agency or office, where the elite can be plainly "seen." Sometimes the members of this junta are in the new and formless agencies, helping shape them into something far more powerful, and dangerous to liberty, than old-line departments whose powers and duties are defined by Congress.

Some members of this band are hidden in the superagencies which have grown up above the Cabinet, like the National Security Agency, and that mystery wrapped in an enigma called the Central Intelligence Agency.

Others are in the U. N. or the bureaus dealing with international affairs.

Some are in the new branch of Government which has grown up about the White House—administrative assistants to the President, the Budget Bureau, and the liaison between the White House, Congress and the pressure groups.

Some members of this new governing apparatus are not in Government office at all. They are journalists and commentators who promulgate the "party line" of the elite, or lawyers or businessmen whose only interest is in high Government policy, like admission of Red China to the U. N.

We are confused because this band does not operate through established channels. Its members do not obey the chain of responsibility which governs the flow of opinions and policies through an orderly system of agencies.

I was much impressed with Whittaker Chambers' story of how Alger Hiss, then with a Senate committee, was offered a job in the Justice Department. He discussed his acceptance with his contact in the Soviet apparatus, Whittaker Chambers, knowing he would refer it to J. Peters, the Soviet "rep." Peters had more power over an American Government employee than his nominal superiors.

The new elite is not a part of our constitutional government. It is above the legally established government. The members are able to defy, to thwart, to undermine, established government because, through control of money, they make the law. The governmental elite today has more influence over lawmaking, over taxes, appropriations, and the shape and size of Government agencies, than either Congress or the President.

Of course the members of this revolutionary elite protest that they serve the President and defer to Congress. That is merely doubletalk. We may summarize the point very simply. Those who work for the secret revolution can have no common interest with anyone in the executive or the legislative branch who is serving the Constitution.

Our Government is now operating through two rival centers of power competing for sovereignty, one under the Constitution, one against it. Every issue and every problem of politics and government must be judged in terms of this irrepressible conflict.

You will find a vivid picture of this elite in the story in the Mundt hearings, of the famous meeting in the Justice Department on January 21, 1954, where John Adams and other employees of the executive branch planned the campaign to discredit the chairman of the Senate committee investigating malfeasance in the executive branch. Why was this little group so busy trying to destroy the reputation and standing of a Republican Senator? Because the Senator was trying to find out how Communists were boring into our Military Establishment and which unknown collaborators were protecting them. Is that a threat to any Government official loyal to our Constitution?

You will recall, also, that momentous scene in the Mundt hearings when we heard how Senator SYMINGTON, a minority member of the committee, had talked by telephone with Secretary of the Army Stevens and proposed that Stevens, a Republican appointee, seek the advice of Clark Clifford, the political adviser of President Truman, for help in undermining the Republican chairman of the committee.

Here we see no executive chain of command, no political party loyalties, no orderly constitutional process. The only possible explanation is that both conferences were guided by the revolutionary elite, who work night and day, to crush obstacles to their power, wherever they arise.

Perhaps some of the people who took part in this meeting did not know what it was all about. But what must the Soviet Union think of our Government, if important offi-

cials do not know when they are being used as dupes, to undermine our Constitution?

I should like to remind you of the story of the worker in a Nazi factory whose wife was going to have a baby. They needed a new baby carriage, but the government would not allow anyone to buy one. The man worked, however, in a factory which made baby carriages. So he suggested to his wife that he could take home, one at a time, the parts from the various departments of the plant, and put them together later.

When the time came to complete the baby carriage, the workman assembled the parts he had collected so carefully from his factory. But—when the pieces were assembled, the worker did not have a baby carriage. He had a machine gun.

"Revolution by assembly line" is the newest weapon of the elite. They devise a program in health, or housing, or foreign policy, perfectly designed to destroy our form of government or our national security. They break their design up into innocent-looking parts, all of which fit perfectly together. They say these are parts for baby carriages.

The hidden revolutionists farm out the making and the selling of these harmless-looking subprograms to simple-minded people who believe all they hear. The parts are manufactured, but they will not be assembled until the public has been so completely brain-washed that they will believe a machinegun is a new style baby carriage.

I might mention here the blueprint for Federal aid to education. Federal control of the minds of our children is as important to the revolutionists as Federal control of the police power.

Innumerable parts of the grand design for federalization of our schools have been submitted over the years. Many of them are an accomplished fact. The Federal Government is paying over two billions a year to local and private educational agencies today.

The newest gimmick is Federal aid in school construction. What could be more pitiful than millions of little children reaching school age, knocking at the doors of our schoolhouses, but told there is no place where they can sit down?

Cold statistical facts cannot overtake that pitiful picture, but they do prove that every State in the Union can today impose taxes enough to supply all its children with schooling.

I ask you, What is happening to our States? What is happening to our Constitution, with its balance between National and State Governments, when our governors go to Washington with a tincup in their hands, asking Federal bureaucrats to please give them back a little bit of their own money for their own schools?

We have then a trained revolutionary elite, working under a hidden chain of command, though nominally working under American governmental checks and balances.

We have a revolutionary new method of seizing power without arousing resistance, which I call revolution by assembly line, or, better yet, revolution by interchangeable parts which lie ready to be put on the assembly line when brainwashing makes it safe.

In the past the great victory of this elite was in foreign policy. Today the area of greatest danger is their search for domination over our Armed Forces. This is the most dangerous of all the steps in the creeping revolution of our time.

The hidden elite rely, in subjecting the fighting forces to their control, on misuse of a sound political principle. They pervert the idea of civilian control, which really means control by elected officials, to mean that the elite who were never elected, rank above our professional military men.

The duty of the armed forces in a free country is to deter or punish outsiders who

threaten to attack the country. They serve the whole nation. The nation is not free if the military serve or oppose any political interest within the nation.

To make certain the armed might of the United States would never be misused, the Constitution introduced three safeguards. It gave to Congress alone the power to declare war. It gave to Congress the duty to raise and equip armies—that is, to decide on their size and their organization—by giving them the money without which they could not operate. In addition, it said that Congress could establish and finance the Armed Forces for a 2-year period only. There is no power in any Congress, for any reason, to make any commitment to raise or equip military forces for a period of over 2 years.

The reason for this is simple. The Armed Forces in action must be directed by the Executive. Legislatures cannot win battles. But the English people found out very early that rulers who raise a military establishment to deal with a foreign enemy are everlastingly tempted to use their power to deal with the unreasonable people who oppose them at home.

The British people struggled for centuries to keep their rulers from getting their own military power and setting up a tyranny at home, as the rulers of France, Spain, Germany, and Russia had done.

The British learned the hard way that the only political power which can control military power is the money power. They put the power over money for the forces safely in the hands of the Parliament.

Let me remind you what this struggle cost. When British commoners stood up in Parliament and resisted the demand of the Tudor Kings they knew their life might be forfeit.

Then Charles I determined to raise his own armies for his foreign wars. John Hampden, a country squire, refused to pay the King's ship-money tax because Parliament had not voted it, though he knew refusal might mean the loss of his head. Instead, the nation rallied to him. The Parliament eventually raised an army to subdue the King and it was Charles whose head fell on the block.

After the revolution of 1688, Parliament put the armed forces firmly under control of the nation by the Mutiny Act, under which the military oath of obedience was dissolved if the ruler attempted to put the military under his personal rule.

The members of our Constitutional Convention had a vivid memory of this terrible civil war. They knew there must be no doubt in the new Government that the only reason for military power was to serve the Nation. They gave the head of the executive branch, as Commander in Chief, full authority over the Armed Forces in action, but they left to the people, through their Congress, full authority over the money to keep them going.

For 175 years Americans have slept at night wholly free from fear that their own soldiery might be used by the Government against them.

This delicate balance of power, which gives clear operating authority over our armies to one branch and clear legal and financial authority to another branch, the new elite works ceaselessly to destroy.

The most important single move was the shift of our fighting forces in Korea to U. N. control.

The decision to go into Korea was taken in our name. Then the U. N., with the Soviet Union mysteriously absent from the Security Council, voted to participate. President Truman was asked to act as U. N. representative in command of a U. N. force, which was almost to a man the American forces already in the field, since Korea was not a member of the U. N.

What is the legal meaning of President Truman's acting as the commander of U. N. military forces? Was he, in his role of U. N. military agent, acting outside the American

Constitution? Did he acquire powers not in the Constitution? Was he freed from limitations set in the Constitution? I do not know.

What of our men? Were the American soldiers, drafted by an American Congress, and sworn to uphold the American Constitution, shifted to a different legal setup?

Did they, as U. N. fighting forces, lose the protections which the American Constitution wraps about our fighting men? I do not know, and I cannot find out.

President Truman apparently took no action as U. N. representative which was outside our Constitution. Perhaps he never knew of any loopholes. Our men were subjected to no visible loss of their constitutional liberties. But remember we are dealing with revolution by interchangeable parts. Was this episode of the U. N. command one of the essential "parts" which was tested and then put aside, later to be assembled into a completed world military organization? Remember, this transfer was made without the consent of Congress. Is that too a precedent? I believe it was.

Congress cannot plead that though it passed a bad law no one has committed any crimes under it. It is the business of Congress to be certain that no legal powers are set up, by which any American President could transfer American fighting men to any international agencies, without the consent of Congress.

The mutual security law has a section which permits the President of the United States to transfer any official or employee of the United States Government to any international agency which (in his opinion) is cooperating with us.

Another provision says he may transfer members of our Armed Forces in peacetime to service with such an international agency.

How many such American civilians and military are now serving with international agencies? What part of our swollen budget goes for this invisible support to world government? What is the constitutional significance of this silent operation?

We know that numbers of foreign troops are now in the United States. But how many troops have been brought in? From how many countries? We hear that Yugoslav forces are being trained here. How many?

What rights and duties do these foreign troops acquire? Who commands their commanders? Does the Commander in Chief of the American Armed Forces command them while on American soil? Is he still limited by the Constitution? Could not their numbers be increased until a future President would have enough foreign troops under his command to settle a domestic political dispute?

Congress cannot be put off with statements that no American President would use such powers. That may be true of past Presidents, of our present President, of the next President. But is this one of the interchangeable parts in a design for Executive control of the armies, which will look as innocent as a baby carriage until it is time to uncover the machinegun? Congress has no choice but to find out.

We have all watched with deep dismay the boasts of the Red Chinese that they have imprisoned 11 Americans, 10 of them uniformed members of the American Air Force. We watched with cold disgust the humble journey of Dag Hammarskjöld to the capital of Red China, to ask Mao Tse-tung to please be nice and release our men.

The U. S. News & World Report has pointed out the danger in the argument that after all these fighting men were soldiers in U. N. armed forces, and must look to U. N. for their protection.

What does our silence signify about America's sovereign right to direct her own armies, her right to demand decent treatment of them according to the laws of war? Have

we made the interchangeable parts for a policy in which American forces are dependent on U. N. for maintenance of their rights? Have we made the interchangeable parts for a policy by which America will have no Army or Navy or Air Force which responds instantly to her orders?

How many pieces of American territory have we given to international organizations? The Daughters of the American Revolution reported to their members a few years ago that the NATO flag was flying above the American flag at NATO headquarters in Norfolk, Va. When asked by what authority land at Norfolk was given for NATO headquarters, Pentagon officials said this transfer was not made by law, and the land was not sold. It was "designated" as NATO territory. By what Presidential or U. N. powers? If the President can give away enough for one flagpole, how many square miles of Norfolk or Hampton Roads or San Diego can be given to NATO or SEATO and cease to be American soil?

Some of us were shocked to hear J. Edgar Hoover say that of course he did not urge Harry White's promotion to the International Monetary Fund, so the FBI could watch him better. The fact was, said Mr. Hoover, that the buildings occupied by the Monetary Fund and the International Fund were international territory and FBI agents could not enter them on official business.

How many square miles of United States territory are no longer open to the FBI and therefore serve as potential refuges for any Communist agents who may choose to use them?

How many American soldiers and sailors within our own borders are serving on international soil today?

I do not need to tell you about the Status of Forces Treaties. But did even one member of the hidden elite envision this step as an essential "part" to make American fighting men fear to oppose political actions of the Government's civil branches?

You will say all these things are small, not very sinister in themselves.

No step is small which reduces the power of Congress to preserve constitutional safeguards over use of the Armed Forces. If the elite really acquires control of our Military Establishment, its authority is complete, because if military power is not under the law, it is above it.

If the day comes when a faction within the executive branch can control the Armed Forces without restraint of law, the revolution will be complete. Congress may write laws and the courts may be open, but government under the law is finished and government by force will be unopposed.

Again and again, wherever the military policies of the elite have conflicted with those of the Nation, the Nation has been the loser. Witness the shrinkage of every military policy we have ever made for Nationalist China or Korea.

In 1953, the revolutionary elite went underground while the Republicans took over the constitutional offices.

In 1954, the elite surfaced again. They were sure we had been put to sleep.

The Berlin Conference, the Geneva Conference, the Indochina debacle, the unprotected violations of the truce in Korea, and the gyrations over EDC and German rearmament, were the "line" of the same hidden revolutionists who had seized control of the democratic party.

Military aid was hog-tied by the revolutionary bloc through FOA. Funds for military aid are appropriated not to the Defense Department but to FOA, an international welfare agency. Much of the appropriation for military aid is spent by FOA, and the rest is spent under the eyes of a body of lawyers in the Defense Department like John Adams.

Disarmament is obviously a key proposal in this revolution by interchangeable parts.

International plans for disarmament not only limit American sovereignty but they add to the power of civilian appointees over our fighting forces. They make our professional military men low men on the totem pole.

German rearmament is authorized in the treaty between Germany on one hand and England, France, and Benelux on the other, a treaty which does not need the consent of the Senate. In this treaty, I find a complete scheme for arms limitation by international control. The key to arms limitation is the reporting system. Under this plan Germany must report every detail about her troops and equipment to an international agency. So must the other members. They must also report contributions of men or equipment they give to NATO or receive from it. All our operations in NATO are an open book. Next comes "regulation," or the veto power over armed strength. German and other forces can be put under ceilings by an administrative board of an international agency though it might be to the great disadvantage of the United States.

I wondered if this plan for forcing German rearmament into a straitjacket of statistical reporting was a dress rehearsal for the United States. The propaganda buildup has already begun.

Now the whole story is pulled together in the appointment of Mr. Harold Stassen, a fervent supporter of internationalism, to a new Cabinet post, created not by Congress, but by the President, to handle peacetime atomic energy, international disarmament, and presumably the new Asian Marshall plan.

This is a honey of a scheme. How Mr. Stassen must have worked to put himself in a position where he outflanks the State Department, the Defense officials, and the American delegation to the U. N., not to mention the Congress!

Mr. Stassen is head of an administrative cluster reaching to the top of the executive hierarchy, with a program which is the climax of the programs spelled out in various forms by Henry Wallace, Dean Acheson, Leon Keyserling, and others, to divide our resources with the rest of the world, while our ablest minds are integrated with those of other nations, so they can do little or nothing for the United States.

In 1951 I said we were being governed by a blueprint for our destruction, and we were right on the timetable. Now the blueprint is so perfect, the whole system is controlled by automation. There are only a few key switches, and the members of the revolutionary elite have the switches in their own hands.

Are we helpless? No; we are not helpless. We have a truly American counterattack to this alien plan.

There is not time to describe the remedies, but I can outline the grand strategy.

We need a drastic cut in taxes. We can never dismantle the elite until we cut taxes.

We need a crusade for States rights. We can never cut taxes until we revive the 10th amendment, which insures that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or the people.

Third, we need a shift from a passive to a dynamic Congress.

Congress today is bogged down in its own machinery. The wheels grind, the gears mesh, the Members of the Senate and the House work hard, too hard, to keep the mass of bills moving through the mill. But that machinery is perfectly fitted to keep Congress pressing out the bills and appropriations the elite feed into it. It is perfectly designed to keep Congress from its main duty—to make sure that all Executive action is within the Constitution, by withholding money from any activity which goes beyond the Constitution.

I hope yet to see the House and the Senate suspend all work on legislation, appropriations, treaties, and appointments, and form themselves into committees of the whole, to end the appropriating of our money to a government within the Government, whose purpose is to abolish the Constitution.

There is ability enough in Congress, there is patriotism enough in Congress, with your help, to end this now before the elite have us firmly meshed into a world state above the law, and American Armed Forces are committed to defend their secret revolution.

Pressures, Politics, and Partnerships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and address on "Pressures, Politics, and Partnerships," which I delivered before the Ninth Annual World Affairs Conference, at Asilomar, Calif., on May 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESSURES, POLITICS, AND PARTNERSHIPS

(Address by Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, before Ninth Annual World Affairs Conference, Asilomar, Calif., May 7, 1955)

When your organization invited me to be with you today, I was impressed by the alliteration in the title of the subject to which I was asked to address my remarks—pressures, politics, and partnerships. There is a certain harmony in the title, but unfortunately, it is confined to the sound of the words. When pressures, politics and partnerships come together in the practice of foreign policy, any resemblance to harmony is strictly coincidental. We are more likely to get the equivalent of three high school bands in a parade, one marching immediately behind the other and each playing a different tune, as loudly as possible.

That may be somewhat exaggerated but I think it does suggest the dimensions of the problem of bringing together these divergent forces in practice.

To carry the simile a little further, if we wished to determine what tune each band was playing, we would have to space them a little apart from one another in the parade. In the same fashion, I would like to separate the elements in this subject of pressures, politics and partnerships in order to see what each is contributing to the general uproar which we identify as foreign policy.

Last August 4, in a press conference, the President stated that he thought "we should talk less about American leadership in the world, because we are trying to be a good partner." I thought that an excellent concept. The partnership concept displayed considerable vitality, as a method of foreign policy, even though it has only recently been identified as such. You will recall, for example, that last fall, progress toward the goal of German alignment with the West was at a stalemate when the French rejected the European Defense Community. Nevertheless, with the United States standing by as a partner rather than forcing its leadership, the European countries quickly devised a new formula for achieving this goal at the London-Paris conferences.

Similarly, this country refrained from any leadership of the band at the Manila Conference last September. I happened to be a member of the American delegation and I can attest to the spirit of cooperation or partnership that operated there. Its results are reflected in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the Pacific Charter which were produced by the conference.

Again last April when the United States indicated that part of the American assistance program for Asia would be channeled on a regional basis, India immediately called a conference of Asian States to reconcile their individual national desires with the plans of the United States.

While partnership is by no means a new conception, it seems to me that the President, quite correctly, has given the concept a new emphasis at this time. It is more important than ever that our relations, particularly with the Western European nations, rest upon this basis. Immediately after the war, those countries were in a state of complete exhaustion. In an economic and in a security sense, their survival as free nations depended heavily on the willingness of this country to aid in their recovery. That period is now largely over and we ought to be happy that it is. The Europeans no longer are dependent on the United States in the degree which existed in the immediate postwar years. They have reached a point at which they may be expected to assert the independence of their position with considerable firmness. They will not readily be pressured into the acceptance or rejection of any particular line of policy. But what they will not do under pressure, I believe they will do willingly under a partnership concept which takes into full consideration their needs and their aspirations.

The partnership concept is the antithesis of policy by pressure. It is a policy of cooperation based on national equality, mutual respect, tolerance of differences, and free association for the pursuit of essentially common goals.

It is easier to preach partnership, however, than to practice it. Each apparent failure of cooperation sets off a new wave of criticism and impatience in large segments of the people in each of the nations involved in the partnership. That was true for example in the case of the Geneva Conference and it has been true to some extent in the case of the Formosan crisis. I think, therefore, we should be aware of some of the difficulties involved in maintaining an effective partnership with other nations. If we are, it may help us to exercise the restraint and understanding which are essential for the operation of this policy.

First, consider for a moment the difficulties in maintaining a unified approach to foreign policy even within our own borders. Here we run into the other two elements in the subject, the politics and the pressures. We have made noticeable efforts in the last few years to minimize the influence of partisan politics in foreign policy. In some years, 1947 and 1948 and again this year, for example, when Congress has been controlled by one political party and the executive branch by the other, bipartisanship has been essential. In other years it has been useful in assuring continuity of action and broad public support for actions which must be taken abroad. It has made possible in certain areas, such as Europe, consistent progress toward the goals of our foreign policy.

In spite of the evident advantage of bipartisanship to the Nation, there are still tendencies on the part of some to play politics with foreign policy problems. I do not speak now of those who out of conviction oppose a particular line of policy. Bipartisanship is not and must never become a mechanism for destroying the right of dissent. What I have in mind are those who seek to make political capital out of our national difficulties. Let me illustrate this

point. As you well know, the Yalta agreement is, to put it mildly, a favorite subject of disagreement in this country. I know there are some who feel that certain aspects of that agreement are unsatisfactory. While I may disagree with them, I respect their right to their viewpoint and their right to express it. History will place the Yalta agreement in proper perspective. I think the politics are evident, however, when I am told, as I have been told, of the story of a local political leader of one of the two great parties. Prior to a recent election he castigated all candidates of the opposition, whether they were running for municipal offices or the Presidency, for being responsible for losing China in the Yalta agreement. Voices of that kind make considerable noise and the noise has often hampered the ability of the Nation to cope with the real difficulties which confront the Nation.

It has become increasingly clear in recent weeks, moreover, that the conduct of foreign policy can be seriously impeded not only by interparty strife but also by intraparty dissension. You people in California would be especially familiar with that. If we have difficulty, then, in agreeing on international courses of action, as between our political parties and within them, is it not to be expected that the difficulties in agreeing with other nations would be even greater?

Added to the problems of maintaining partnership that are produced by partisan politics are those stemming from internal pressures. There is, first of all, the pressure of tradition. Partnership represents a substantial departure from what was, for a long time, regarded as established American policy. References are still frequently made to George Washington's advice "to steer clear of permanent alliances."

I do not in any way question the sincerity of the cautions and careful approach of many Americans to foreign commitments; I share it. We should be cautious and careful and we are not unique in this respect. The British people, for example, have displayed quite correctly in my opinion something very much akin to these traits in connection with their integration with western Europe.

I say at the same time, however, that we ought not to quote glibly from George Washington without comparing the world situation which existed in his time with that which exists today. I say that we should not expect George Washington's sage advice in the 18th century to spare us the necessity of making the difficult and often painful decisions of foreign policy in the 20th century.

Both political parties, as a whole, have rejected pure isolationism as a policy for the United States of today. In a world as integrated as is ours today chance seems slight that we alone can continue to make progress while the rest of it slips from the retrogression of totalitarianism. From a practical standpoint, we would have little hope for continued survival and material advance as a free people if we cut ourselves off from the economic, the defensive, the cultural and the scientific relationships which we now have with other nations. We can reach greater heights of lasting prosperity and peace only in concert with others.

There continue to be a few who cherish the short-sighted notion that the United States is a self-sufficient, invulnerable fortress. They would like for the United States to turn inward in space and backward in time. In addition, there are others who have abandoned this isolationist philosophy only with utmost reluctance. These profess a willingness to take part in world affairs and to cooperate with other nations provided in effect that other nations accept our terms, absolutely and unquestioningly. That is not cooperation. It is a form of American paternalism or dictation. It leads often to the futile attempt to buy friends

and bludgeon people, all supposedly in the interest of this country.

To those Americans who think in such terms, partnership as an approach to foreign policy is particularly difficult to accept. They become distressed whenever overall agreement with our allies is clouded by a disagreement, however minor, and they are forever threatening to pick up their marbles and go home. They are not convinced that we really need cooperation with others. On the other hand, they are not sure we do not. As a compromise, therefore, they assume that cooperation is acceptable provided others talk exactly like us and act exactly like us. One result of pressures of this kind is that we face the danger that our aid programs are based not on the actual needs of our national policies but on the relative skills of foreign diplomats in the art of talking and acting in the fashion that some Americans like them to talk and act. Another result is a constant clamor to abandon important allies on the slightest provocation. Sooner or later we are going to have to learn that sweet and agreeable words alone do not necessarily make staunch friends in the international arena any more than in our personal lives. We will find, I think, that substantially common interests and objectives and give and take with equals who speak their minds is a more reliable indicator of the worth of some of these alliances.

We are bound to have differences, sometimes rather large and important differences with friendly nations. We cannot hope to, indeed should not want to eliminate the differences which are the hallmark of freedom. Any attempt to do so will leave us in the position of the Soviet Union and its satellites. That is a monolithic system in which the most powerful member bludgeons the others into line. And it is precisely that monolithic characteristic which we expect to result eventually in the disintegration of the Soviet system. Unless we are looking for the same thing to happen to the ties among the free nations, it ill becomes us to employ the same techniques as the Soviet Union.

The points of view which I have been discussing are held by many Americans. It is their right to hold them and to express them. It is also proper, however, to discuss the impact of these views on our foreign policy. Sometimes the paramount national view becomes obscured by these conflicting voices and the executive branch finds it difficult to hold to a consistent policy. Nations abroad are also confused by the clashing viewpoints which often emanate from the United States. They may well wonder which one underlies American policy at any given moment. Each election here gives them pause to consider whether or not a new composition of the Government will result in an abandonment of free-world cooperation.

Even for those Americans who fully accept the necessity of allies and sincerely desire to cooperate, partnership is an advanced and difficult technique of policy. It requires more skill, and more understanding than a policy which does not concern itself with public opinion beyond its own borders. It requires initiative and it requires an emphasis on constructive, long-range measures. It requires much more than slick slogans or easy handouts of aid.

Perhaps the clearest example of the difficulty of practicing good partnership may be found in the economic realm. In 1947-48 the United States, for reasons of self-interest as well as out of humanitarian motives, established the foreign aid programs to help the war-torn countries of Western Europe get back on their feet. These programs involved substantial gifts and transfers of American resources to foreign countries. As American aid, coupled with the hard work of the Europeans themselves, began to restore the economy of Western Europe, the relation-

ship of donor and recipient, inherent in the program, created dissatisfaction among all concerned. Among Americans there was a growing resentment at the prolongation of the giveaway of resources. The Europeans, on the other hand, also grew a little tired of playing the role of poor relatives. One-way aid was no longer adequate to the needs of the situation. What was needed and is needed are new methods for assuring a durable solution to the economic problems of the free nations.

The partnership concept suggests the desirability of terminating one-way aid quickly and substituting mechanisms of cooperation on a basis of greater equality of responsibility and effort among the free nations. To find these mechanisms is primarily the task of creative statesmanship. It is a much slower and a much more difficult undertaking than the doling out of dollars, and there has been a tendency to put it off. Here again, however, leadership in the free nations faces domestic counter pressures. It is handicapped in taking the road of partnership by the fact that there are specific groups in the United States and elsewhere which would be injured, at least in the short run, by alterations in present economic patterns among the nations of the world. Some, in effect, would prefer that we give away our resources rather than get back something for them in trade. Domestic considerations of this kind cannot be ignored. On the other hand, neither can we ignore the requirements for building free and peaceful cooperation among self-reliant and self-respecting nations. I do not have an easy answer to this dilemma, but the partnership concept calls for all to make a sincere attempt to find the answers.

There are many other domestic pressures which have varying degrees of influence on the partnership approach. For example, America is composed of many different racial and religious groups. These groups sometimes feel a particular responsibility for the land of their origin, and political appeals are often made to them on that basis. You will recall, for example, that before the last presidential election, we heard much irresponsible talk about the liberation of the Poles, the Czechs, and other eastern European peoples. And Sir Robert Scott, I believe, would be familiar with the vehement pressure which operates on London by way of New York, Chicago, Boston, and elsewhere in this country to end the unholy division of the Emerald Isle, particularly on St. Patrick's Day.

Moreover, if we consider the geographic span of the United States, it is to be expected that regionalism plays some part in our thinking. We in the West may tend to be especially interested in the Far East. Those on the east coast may be more concerned with our relations with Europe. Often persons from our southern States emphasize the problems of our relations with Latin America. All these influences affect our policy. The surprising thing, however, is that there is as much of a common outlook as does exist.

So far I have been speaking largely of the politics and pressures in our own society which sometimes make it difficult for the United States to operate a policy of partnership. These same influences, or close counterparts, exist in all democratic countries with which we are allied.

Certainly we are not the only nation in which domestic politics affect foreign policy. In any country there are political groups which, if in power, conceivably would alter that country's policies respecting us. Because we are not sure what effect a change of political complexion will have, we become tremendously concerned, for example, with the outcome of elections in Great Britain, France, Germany, or Italy. Moreover, governments sometimes, in order to stay in power, may make concessions to elements of

their population even though such concessions hamper their ability to cooperate with us and other allies.

Neutralist thinking in Europe in some ways parallels the neoisolationist viewpoint in America. The neutralists would like to believe that they can say "a plague on both your houses" and have it mean security for themselves. If they are not entangled with either the Soviet bloc or the United States, they say they will be exempt from attack by either side. Their difficulty, as with our own neoisolationists is that they cannot escape the fundamental reality of the 20th century, namely, that no nation or even a small group of nations is an island unto itself. The threat is to freedom and if freedom declines in large segments of the Western World, as it will unless there is unity, it will be replaced by a totalitarianism which sooner or later will engulf all who strive to remain neutral.

Other nations, like ourselves, also find it difficult to attempt new courses of action even when the methods of the past have lost much of their usefulness. In Europe, for example, the advantages of integration are widely recognized. The larger market which would result, the abolition of trade barriers, customs, and varying currencies, would probably contribute much toward increasing the prosperity of the entire region. The sublimation of national groups into a regional Western Europeanism might even help to bring an end to the intra-European conflicts which have twice plunged the whole world into devastating war. Strengthening of Western Europe in this manner is regarded by many in this country as the best defense against totalitarian communism. However, Europeans find it difficult to bring about unification even as we find it easy to urge it.

What I have been trying to do today is to point out a few of the questions involved in maintaining a united, a partnership approach among the free nations. Most of the difficulties of politics and pressures which stand in the way are shared difficulties. The problem confronting us and other free nations is to make certain that these difficulties serve as a challenge to common action rather than as a source of division or diversion from our common purpose.

Partnership requires forbearance, compassion, understanding, and accommodation. It is not an easy approach to foreign policy. If it succeeds, however, it can produce a united strength which will make each free nation impervious both to the blustering threats and the glittering allures of totalitarianism. Most of all it will provide an international environment in which individuals in this country and elsewhere will have an opportunity to develop and to prosper in peace.

Columbia University Commencement Address by Hon. Allen W. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there was comment on the floor of the Senate when the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] received degrees from Columbia University. At the same time Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, also received a degree. At that time he delivered a very interesting address, which I ask unani-

mous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, ON EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET UNION, AT 53D ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT DAY LUNCHEON AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 1

It is indeed an honor to be among those to whom Columbia University is today giving degrees and to have the opportunity to address this distinguished group of Columbia graduates, as the university starts upon its third century of service.

I have other and more personal reasons to feel gratitude to Columbia. Some 35 years ago I married the daughter of the head of your department of Romanic Languages. There has been no occasion for me to regret this or any other of the many pleasant relations which I have had with this great university.

Much of the work of the Central Intelligence Agency is focused on developments in the Soviet Union, and its European and far eastern satellites and allies.

Naturally, we are particularly concerned with information on the military and industrial strength of the Communist world. However, we also follow the cultural development behind the Iron Curtain, and recently we have been giving close study to the Soviet educational system.

If, as recent events foreshadow, there is likely to be more direct human contact between the West and the Communist world, the impact of our own educational system on that of the Soviet may become a factor of real significance.

So far this has not been the case. The Iron Curtain is not merely a physical barrier. It has also obstructed cultural exchanges. Not only have human beings been prevented from crossing Communist frontiers; ideas also have not freely travelled back and forth.

The Communists have willed it so, and at vast costs in the diversion of manpower and in money they have erected physical barriers and jamming stations by the hundreds to keep the ideas of the West out of the Communist world.

The key to the future of any society lies very largely in its educational system.

Scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union today presents a challenge to the free world. But mass education in the Soviet Union may well become a threat to their own Communist system of government.

The Soviet have two educational goals. First, to condition the Soviet people to be proper believers in Marxist-Leninism and to do the bidding of their rulers. Second, to turn out the necessary trained technicians to build the military and industrial might of the U. S. S. R.

In the field of science the Soviets have made rapid progress and their accomplishments here should not be minimized; least of all by those of us who are directly concerned with our national security.

Twenty-five years ago, Soviet scientific education was riddled with naive experiments, persecution of scholars, and unrealistic programs. Only a small core of older men kept alive an element of real quality on which to build. Reforms in the mid-1930's raised standards considerably, but even so they were behind our western standards when the war came.

Today, that is no longer so. The Soviet education system—in the sciences and engineering—now bears close comparison with ours, both in quality of training and in numbers of persons trained to a high level.

At the university graduate level, we find that the entrance examinations for scientific work, at the top institutions, are about

as tough as those required by our own institutions.

Also, we have the evidence obtained from defectors, some of them recent, who were university graduates. Although these men have come over to us because of their detestation of the Soviet system many of them still pay tribute to the technical quality of their education and appear to look back at least on this part of their lives with some pride and pleasure.

As regards Soviet scientific manpower as a whole, the quality differs greatly from field to field. But generally speaking their top men appear to be the equal of the top men in the West, though they have fewer of them, level for level.

True, their biology has been warped by Soviet ideology, most conspicuously by heresies in the field of genetics, such as the doctrine that acquired characteristics are inherited. Also, their agricultural sciences have been backward, plagued like all of Soviet agriculture by the follies of the collective system. What farmer will go out into the middle of a cold Russian night to see what ails a state-owned cow?

In the physical sciences, there is little evidence of such political interference. Soviet mathematics and meteorology, for example, appear to be clearly on a par with those of the West, and even ahead in some respects.

Military needs dominate their research programs. We who are in intelligence work have learned by now that it is rarely safe to assume that the Soviets do not have the basic skill, both theoretical and technical, to do in these fields what we can do.

In fact, at times we have been surprised at their progress, above all in the aviation, electronic, and nuclear fields. Certainly, the Russian's mind, as a mechanism of reason, is in no way inferior to that of any other human being.

It is true that since the war, the Soviets have been helped by German scientists taken to the U. S. S. R. and by what they learned from espionage and from the material obtained during and after the war. Also, recently the Soviets have developed, and boasted of, a systematic service for translating and abstracting major western scientific publications.

But the Soviets have rarely been slavish copyists, at least where a Western invention or technique was of military importance. They have employed adaptation rather than adoption, as in the case of their improvement of the Nene jet engine. In certain key fields they have clearly shown a capacity for independent progress.

While total Soviet scientific manpower at the university graduate level is about the same as ours—somewhere over a million each—about half of the Soviet total were trained by the inferior prewar standards. In number of research workers—a good index of average quality—we estimate that the United States has a 2 to 1 margin over the U. S. S. R. in the physical sciences.

We must remember, too, that the United States has a substantial number of competent engineers who have not taken university degrees but have learned their trade through experience. The U. S. S. R. has no real counterpart for this group, just as it has no substantial counterpart for the vast American reservoir of persons with high-grade mechanical skills.

But lest we become complacent, it is well to note that the Soviets are now turning out more university graduates in the sciences and engineering than we are—about 120,000 to 70,000 in 1955. In round numbers, the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figure will be about 900,000.

Unless we quickly take new measures to increase our own facilities for scientific education, Soviet scientific manpower in key

areas may well outnumber ours in the next decade.

These comparisons in the scientific field most emphatically do not mean that Soviet higher education as a whole is as yet comparable to that of the United States. Over 50 percent of Soviet graduates are in the sciences, against less than 20 percent in the United States. Science in the U. S. S. R. has had an overriding priority.

Another important feature of Soviet education is the growth of secondary education at the senior high school level. By 1960 the Soviets will have 4 to 5 times as many secondary graduates per year as they had in 1950. These will be divided fairly evenly between men and women. Whereas, a decade ago, only about 20 percent of Soviet seventh grade students went any further, by 1960 probably over 70 percent will do so. Their secondary school standards are high and largely explain their ability to train competent scientists and engineers. Whether they can maintain these standards in the face of a very rapid expansion is a question.

So much for the advance in material terms. Let us turn now to the thought-control aspect.

The Soviets give top priority to preserving the Marxist-Leninist purity of their students. Beginning with kindergarten rhymes on the glories of Lenin, they pass to the history of the Communist Party, a comparison of the "benevolent" Soviet constitution with the "corrupt" constitutions of the West that do not confer liberty. Soviet economics teaches why the workers in capitalist countries can never own cars, but must always live in poverty. In the lower grades civic virtue is taught by citing the example of a Soviet boy, Pavlik Morozov, who betrayed his family to the secret police and now has statues raised in his honor.

Even though it is hard to distort the physical sciences, they are used to prove the virtues of athletism. In ancient history, it is the Athenians who are corrupt and the Spartans virtuous. In literature courses, selected works of Dickens are read as presenting an authentic picture of the present-day life of the British workingman, while Howard Fast, Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Grapes of Wrath portray the contemporary United States.

Everything is taught so that the student shall acquire his knowledge in Communist terms and within a Communist framework. But the Soviets are not content to rely upon the lasting effects of student indoctrination. They have devised in addition a rigid system for continuing their control.

To repay the Government for his or her so-called "free" education, Soviet law requires that each student upon graduation must work for 3 consecutive years as the state directs.

They may express a preference, but in practice only a small percentage of the students—those with high Government connections or with exceptionally high marks—have their requests granted. The rest must go where they are assigned—their niche in life largely predetermined.

Even at the end of the 3-year compulsory assignment, the individual still is under the control of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the local union, or the factory directors. To object to further assignments is to court an efficiency report so bad that a job will be hard to find. And if a man were to refuse an assignment, he would lose his occupation and be forced to work at the most unskilled and menial tasks wherever he could find them.

Thus, the typical Soviet university graduate gains little freedom from his status as an educated man. If he is a scientist or engineer, he will probably be able to avoid the military draft entirely. He may aspire to prestige and to much higher pay than his less educated fellows. But he pays for this by

being possibly even more tightly directed than the bulk of Soviet workers.

Such, then, is the system, stressing high technical educational standards on the one hand while insisting on Communist philosophy and discipline on the other. Its ultimate human result, the Soviet graduate, must be—in the phrase given me by one of the best-educated of our recent defectors—"a man divided."

In time, with the growth of education—with more knowledge, more training of the mind, given to more people—this Soviet "man divided" must inevitably come to have more and more doubt about the Communist system as a whole.

In the past, we have sometimes had exaggerated expectations of dissensions within the Soviet and in other totalitarian systems. Our hopes have not perhaps been so much misguided as they have been premature. If we take a longer look we can foresee the possibility of great changes in the Soviet system. Here the educational advances will play a major part.

There is already evidence of this. As I have said, the physical sciences are being freed of party-line restraints. Within the educational structure itself, the pressure to turn out good scientists and good engineers has caused a de-emphasis of the time spent on ideological subjects. The student engineer, while he still has to pass his courses in Marxist-Leninism, can increasingly afford to do a purely formal job on the ideological front if he is a good engineer.

In the last year there have been interesting signs of this freedom spreading to other areas, notably to the biological and agricultural sciences. Lysenko is no longer gospel—I suspect for the very simple reason that his theories proved fallacious when used as the basis for new agricultural programs. The development of corn and of better wheat strains proved remarkably resistant to the teachings of Marx and Lenin—and in the end, nature won the day. After all, Karl Marx was not much of a farmer. Now Moscow is looking toward Iowa.

So far, this is only a small straw in the wind. But it is a significant one. If freedom to seek truth can spread from the physical to the biological sciences, we can begin to look for signs of independence even in the hallowed sanctum of economics. Certainly, every year that the decadent capitalist system continues to avoid depression and to turn out more and more goods even the most hardened Soviet economist must wonder about the accuracy of the Communist version of truth in this field.

In cultural pursuits, the evidence is not all one-sided. Literature and even music are still subject to denunciation and criticism for not expressing the proper ideals. But clearly, here, too, there has been some relaxation in the past 2 years. Recently, writers once denounced as bourgeois and cosmopolitan are being permitted to work again.

It is understandable that lasting freedom will come more slowly in economics and the humanities than where scientific matters—more open to proof—are involved. Ideology gives way most rapidly where it collides with fact.

This at times has caused the Soviet acute embarrassment.

We are all familiar with the deceptions the Soviets practice on their people, particularly in the rewriting of history and the adjustment of doctrine to fit their wants. Malenkov is on the downgrade, so the Soviet press removes his name from the key wartime committees on which he actually served, and replaces him with Khrushchev. Beria falls. His name must be blacked out wherever it occurs even in a university catalog and he must posthumously bear the blame for what Stalin and Molotov did to Yugoslavia in 1948.

This often has its laughable side. In the Beria case, the 1950 edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia was issued with a full four pages describing him as "one of the outstanding leaders" of the USSR and the "faithful disciple of Stalin." After his liquidation a few years later, subscribers to the encyclopedia received a letter from the publishers suggesting that 4 designated pages—no mention made of Beria—be removed with scissors or razor blade, and replaced by a large added section to the article on the Bering Sea and by a new article on a gentleman named Friedrich Wilhelm Berg-holz, an obscure junker at the Court of Tsar Peter the First, whose alphabetical resemblance to Beria was his one and only claim to fame.

Perhaps most of the scissor-wielders managed to keep a straight face. Yet this kind of thing, insignificant individually, typifies the kind of dilemma the Soviet must face increasingly and almost daily.

We know that some thoughtful Soviet citizens are beginning to see through these distortions, and indeed through the whole process of thought-control. Yet that process may continue to have its effect on the masses of the Russian people. Will this equally be so when the average educational level of those masses is at the 10th grade rather than the 7th or lower?

Increased education must inevitably bring in its train increased expectations on the part of the educated. Since higher education in Russia had historically been only for the few, not only in czarist times but until very recently in the Soviet era, there remains a strong tradition that a boy who graduates from secondary school will not work with his hands. Over the past 2 years the Soviet press has repeatedly printed criticisms of students who refused to take factory jobs on the ground that they were beneath them. In all probability, the system is nearly at saturation point in the rate at which it can offer professional or white-collar jobs to secondary school graduates.

Ultimately, however much the Soviets condition a man's mind, however narrowly they permit it to develop, and however much they seek to direct him after he is trained, they cannot in the end prevent him from exercising that critical sense that they, themselves, have caused to be created in him when they gave him an education.

When Wendell Wilkie visited the Soviet Union in 1942, he had a look at their school system. In a conversation at the Kremlin he remarks: " * * * if you continue to educate the Russian people, Mr. Stalin, the first thing you know you'll educate yourself out of a job." This seemed to amuse the Soviet dictator mightily. Maybe it will prove to be anything but a joke for the Soviet rulers of the future.

For the Soviets face a real dilemma between the two goals of their education system; on the one hand making well-conditioned members of a Communist state, and on the other, turning out trained people capable of taking their places in a technically advanced society.

In some degree this dilemma has been present since the Soviets took the crucial decisions in the 1930's to go all out for trained technical manpower. It must become more acute in the future. The rise in numbers of trained people is only beginning to reach its peak, at a time when the picture for all Soviet citizens is one of somewhat greater hope and expectation, and when change is in the wind in many ways.

The broadening of the educational base within, the contacts with the outside world, the uncertainty in the high governmental command, and the absence of a dictator all force the Soviet Union toward compromises.

With these compromises, comes the inevitable admission that the Soviet Marxist-

Leninist system is not the only permissible way of life. If coexistence should really become the Moscow line, the western free systems must be permissible and if permissible anywhere, why not permissible in the Soviet Union itself.

If the Tito form of heresy, denounced a few years ago more ferociously even than capitalism, is now to be forgiven and approved, how can the Soviet deny the European satellites the right to a similar heresy if they so desire?

Can the Soviets give their people a better material education and still keep them from wanting more and from thinking more on lines such as these?

I do not think we can easily give the answer in point of time, but one can say with assurance that in the long run, man's desire for freedom must break any bonds that can be placed around him.

Possibly for a time the Soviets will go forward, using their educational system as a sorting device for human assets. Half-educated men—all fact and no humanity—may still be good fodder for totalitarianism.

Possibly the Soviet leaders will encounter problems for which they will seek the solutions by foreign adventures.

But there remains the possibility that newly created wants and expectations, stimulated by education and perhaps by more exposure to the West, will in time compel great and almost unpredictable changes in the Soviet system itself.

Once or twice before this present peace and coexistence offensive, the Soviet seemed to start toward adjustment of its system to the facts of life in the outside world; first in the latter years of the war, and possibly again in 1946. These starts were quickly followed by a dropping of the Iron Curtain, by repression, purges, and a return to the rigid Stalinist line.

Then the Soviet had a dictator, and it's hard to dictate without one. Today they have a committee in which the Soviet people themselves are not clearly told who is boss. Also today, the Soviet have gone much further than before toward introducing into their system the heaven of education, which makes a return to the Dark Ages far more difficult than in the past.

I would not be bold enough to predict that the Soviet might not attempt to return to the rigidity of a Stalinist regime. I do predict that this would be no easy task. In introducing mass education the troubled Soviet leaders have loosed forces dangerous to themselves. It will be very difficult for them henceforth to close off their own people from access to the realities of the outside world.

A hard choice faces the perplexed, and probably unharmonious, group of men in the Kremlin. They lead a people who surely will come to realize the inevitability of the great precept: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at Dedication of New School at Harrod, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the new school at Harrod, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BENDER URGES EXPANDED COURSE ON AMERICAN CIVILIZATION IN DEDICATING NEW HARROD AND WESTMINSTER SCHOOL

(School dedication address by Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER, at Harrod, Ohio, May 27, 1955)

I am very happy to be here with you on this important occasion. The dedication of a new school is always a happy event. When it coincides with a major holiday celebration such as Memorial Day, it becomes even more meaningful.

Perhaps the strongest single factor in preserving our Republic through 180 years of continuous problems has been the free American school system. Nowhere in the world has any nation made an even remotely comparable effort to provide education for its people. The boys and girls who grow up in our country, no matter where they live, always carry with them into maturity a reservoir of knowledge which they tap every day of their lives.

I know that in this field there will always be new worlds to conquer. We shall never have enough education. We shall always provide more and more of it for every succeeding generation.

It is sometimes amazing to people who come from large metropolitan centers when they meet brilliant young people from smaller towns. They often find it difficult to understand how these young people have gained their knowledge, their poise, and their determination to succeed. I never wonder. I have seen their roots in communities like your own throughout our State and throughout America.

It is wonderful to see new schools springing up everywhere in our country, offering the best and most progressive ideas of modern education. No one who has ever gone through a great school system can fail to marvel at the facilities and the opportunities offered to our young people today. This is an age of great technical advancement.

I have checked through a list of great atomic scientists. It is refreshing to discover that many of them received their initial training in small communities from all over the world. They were stimulated to work and to develop by inspiring teachers. They enjoyed the benefit of small classes. Out of the life and thought of young people from rural communities have come some of the most incredible achievements of modern science.

I think that there are other important considerations which the dedication of a new school should call to mind. We in America have prided ourselves throughout our history on the essential freedom of the American spirit. We believe in free inquiry, free speech, and academic freedom. To us, there are no forbidden subjects.

Today there are some people in our country who are confused by Communist propaganda. They say that America is losing its liberal approach to education and learning, that we are stifling freedom of speech and thought. I say to these people that they do not understand the basic difference between Communist doctrine and the American way of life. We believe in the right of every man to question and to probe. That right is denied by communism. The Communists have taken a leaf from the Nazi book. They have created Communist science, Communist music, Communist art. In this process, they reject the basic spirit of academic freedom. Yet, in the name of that same freedom, they demand the right to peddle their propaganda throughout the world.

Some liberals in our country have fallen into a weird trap. They are in a mental dilemma. On the one hand, they do not like communism, yet they insist upon the right

of Communists to preach it wherever they choose.

If these same Communists should ever succeed in dominating American life they would immediately end all the liberal dilemma. There would be no liberals. There would be no choice. There would be no freedom to teach or to study or to conduct research. The state would take over. Those programs which followed the party line could be taught. Everything else would be taboo.

This is a significant consideration in my thinking, as we dedicate this new school. Young lives will be shaped here in ways beyond our most vivid imagination. Boys and girls, young men and women of tomorrow, will come into this building and will leave it richer by far than children anywhere else in the world. There is today a growing need for moral and spiritual guidance in public affairs. The schools must be a source from which tomorrow's generation may take new courage and new confidence.

These are questions which transcend individual differences and political controversy. American schools spend the largest single share of our tax moneys in every local community.

They are our investment in the future, to the extent that we succeed in preserving the greatest contribution which our Republic has made to world history. This is the test pattern, the proving ground, the training area. Our country is engaged at this moment in a cold war. It is a war for the minds of men. It can be won if our leadership develops educational procedures and programs which will overwhelmingly convince our people that our way of life is the greatest, richest, most satisfying system of life which man has ever created.

I am persuaded that the only way in which we can achieve this goal is through the rearing of a generation which will cherish the ideals for which Americans lived and died. On this Memorial Day weekend, Lincoln's great words of dedication are quickly called to mind. Today it is for us to be dedicated to the great purposes for which our men gave the last full measure of devotion through two world wars and on the hills of Korea. This dedication is, in truth, a rededication to the ideals of freedom, human understanding, helpfulness, and progress for all mankind.

Sometimes in the daily routine of teaching and learning our teachers and our students lose sight of the forest in the maze of trees. We forget the ideals. Nevertheless, they are there. In every task which the devoted men and women who teach in this school undertake, in every subject taught and learned within these walls, the spirit of freedom is planted and nurtured. Parents, teachers, administrators, and students are partners in this great cause.

I hope that the people of Harrod and Westminster will share for many years the great personal satisfaction which comes from knowing that you have left a great legacy for your children. This is the glory of America—that each generation builds upon the tradition, the heritage, and the foundation of its predecessor.

I have reviewed the courses of instruction offered in our public-school system, from the elementary level through our colleges. In recent years, we have begun to emphasize the humanities. We have discovered that social studies are stimulating and worthwhile courses for young people. Some 5 years ago, Lafayette College organized an interesting experimental course called creative centuries.

It was designed to cross departmental lines, and combines a study of great ideas with a survey of western civilization.

It seems to me that American boys and girls would profit from a similar effort within the framework of our elementary and secondary school system. America has built a

unique civilization in our curricula. We have discussed Magna Carta, the French Revolution, and the fight against the medieval "Divine Right of Kings." I am certain that we have never fully defined or emphasized the originality of thinking, the daring innovations in political science which went into the Constitution of the United States. A course on our American civilization with all that it implies would be a splendid addition to our school program.

Our civilization is far from being an adaptation or a modification of the British tradition. It is by all odds the nearest approach to complete freedom of political choice the world has ever known. Nowhere in the world does a nation have such jealousy preserved rights to select its own leaders and determine its own way of life. We cannot overemphasize this truth in a generation which takes freedom too often for granted.

Let us resolve together that we shall do our share in the preservation of this great educational ideal. It can move mountains. It is a faith in God and man. Upon it, America will always rise stronger than any enemies who may assail us.

**Commencement Day Address by Hon.
Mike Mansfield, of Montana, at Mary-
mount High School, Arlington, Va.**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a commencement address which I delivered at Marymount High School, Arlington, Va., on June 2, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, AT MARYMOUNT HIGH SCHOOL, ARLINGTON, VA., JUNE 2, 1955

It is with a deep sense of pride that I am here today to address the 1955 graduating class of Marymount. Commencement day is a momentous occasion in the life of every young lady. If your formal education ends today or if you go on to schools of higher learning, I think that you will find that Marymount has done much to shape the lives of all of you, a realization which will be more fully recognized in future years.

I do not come here with any great words of wisdom. Anything I have to say on this joyous and yet solemn occasion can do little to impress upon you the great tasks that are before you. You are at the beginning of a new phase in your lives as adults. You will have momentous decisions to make, decisions which no one else can make. Those of you being honored here today are graduating into a complex world which needs leadership and skills of all kinds in the near future. It will be you young ladies who will be called upon to meet these challenges.

Thirty years ago the future for women was very limited. This is no longer so. Today I venture to say that many of you in this class of 1955 will find yourselves within a few short years in New York, San Francisco, Paris, Mexico City, Tokyo, Bogota, or equally cosmopolitan centers. You will be working for the Government, for private industry, or with your husbands. Many of you will have your own profession. The

choice, as you can see, is much more varied than it used to be. I think it is safe to say that opportunities for capable young women are limitless.

Thirty years ago American interests were very limited. We were concerned largely about our own domestic problems. Today we live in the greatest nation on earth. American interests are scattered across the globe. We in America have been jolted into a new realization of the force of the world. We can no longer isolate ourselves from the affairs of international scope. The modern modes of transportation have brought us within hours of any point on either of the hemispheres. We have moved into a new age—the age of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. Our scientists have made fantastic advances in the realm of massive destruction. With a concerted effort these phenomenal accomplishments can be redirected to the benefit of mankind. We have recognized widespread human need and have set about through various assistance programs to assist the worthy and needy. In the post-war years the principal force with which we have had to contend is militant communism. We have preserved our freedom which has been so threatened by the rise of totalitarian communism, and we will continue to do so.

Domestically, we in the United States are enjoying a prosperity seldom, if ever, known in the past. With a little initiative and determination the future for our young people will look exceedingly bright.

I need not dwell upon the responsibilities and decisions facing you in the next year and the years to come, for I am sure you are cognizant of these things. Many of you will continue your education, perhaps others of you will marry soon.

All of that is ahead of you. What is important for you to do today is to look back over the wonderful years you have spent at Marymount. You are at a certain point in life where you should stand back and look at yourselves. You are departing today from what may likely be the happiest and most pleasant period of your lives.

Looking back over the past several years in this outstanding institution, can a Marymount graduate feel that she is ready to commence a life of full personal initiative in a world of turmoil and strife? I think so. The graduates of Marymount are well equipped to embark on the journey of life and to meet with confidence the challenge of the coming years. Yours has been the privilege of able guidance throughout the academic period by the reverend Mothers and Sisters, competent in the arts, the sciences, and, most important, the things spiritual. The reverend Mothers and Sisters have sought to develop in you the moral and intellectual virtues and to give you a complete education. They have sought to convince you that happiness and perfection are not necessarily found in the pursuit of wealth, fame, or power, but rather in the unselfish devotion to God and His designs for all of you.

You have been trained here to be leaders in Catholic thought and action, in the service of God and country. That leadership will be a constructive one if you put into practice the fundamental principles and truths which you have learned here as students. Despite the temporary discomforts and the consistency of conduct demanded, if you fail to adhere to these first principles in your own life, your leadership will have lost its value.

Beyond the academic accomplishments of high school, I am sure that all of you have gained tremendously in other areas. Perhaps one of the most important of the extra-curricular benefits is that you now recognize the value of doing things together. The young ladies enrolled at Marymount have a commendable record in community effort on the part of its students. Some of your lifelong friendships have been formed here.

You will have many fond memories encompassing your efforts in drama, sports, music, writing, and the other activities which add so much to the spirit of a school.

Nothing you graduates can possibly do will enrich yourselves more or hasten the triumph of faith or make a better contribution to your country than to proclaim and demonstrate the faith and learning you have gathered here at Marymount throughout your lifetime. May each of you bring something to a world in need of light and understanding.

In conclusion, I wish to extend to each of you my congratulations and best wishes for the years to come. The reverend Mothers and the Sisters can look with great pride upon this 1955 graduating class. Your parents, relatives, and friends join with them in wishing you Godspeed and good luck.

Shall We Let the Veteran Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, any attempt to terminate our national responsibility by throwing our aged and disabled veterans and their widows back on the States as community responsibilities should be met with unyielding resistance by the Congress and by the American people; and I have no doubt that such resistance would be immediate, for the integrity of a nation is surely found in the character of its people. Ours is the most grateful people on earth.

For a considerable time now, antiveteran elements have been sounding the waters in quest of another Economy Act. Although there is now less than 2 percent of our total population on the Veterans' Administration veterans compensation and pension rolls, scare economists falsely propagandize that the Nation is actually confronted with the care of 21 million veterans. The veterans civil service law is likewise under attack. Apparently, according to the scare economists, we can only economize at the expense of the veteran.

The great John C. Calhoun once said:

Economy is certainly a very high political virtue; but it is often made into political quackery.

That is just as true today, and whenever and wherever false economy has been practiced on an intensive scale, history shows that it has led to certain disaster. The so-called Economy Act of 1933 actually bears the shameful title: "An Act To Maintain the Credit of the United States Government." But, as we all know, that instrument was aimed at the heart of the veteran. It was false economy in the raw. Not only did that act not maintain or improve the credit of the Government, it resulted in untold misery and literally thousands of untimely deaths. Thousands and thousands of worthy disabled veterans were dropped from the compensation rolls while other thousands had their disability compensation drastically reduced—this in the midst of the greatest economic

depression in world history. No, Mr. Speaker, the Congress will never be tricked into a similar debacle.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we hear talk of a scheme to put our aged veterans and their widows under State old-age assistance plans. That would probably be the first step in the disintegration of the Veterans' Administration, and the outright abolishment of the traditional national responsibility for the care of our veterans and their survivors since their affairs would thereby be transferred to some 50 States and Territories. Bearing in mind that old-age assistance as now constituted is a Federal-State partnership—wholly administered by the States and Territories—let us ask ourselves some pertinent questions.

The first question is: Would the States agree to such a scheme? Obviously before it could be enacted every State would have to agree to it. Then the next important question is:

Would the States be required to foot a substantial part of the cost—in line with the present old-age assistance plans? If so, what would happen in the event a State legislature should fail to appropriate funds for such payments? Could the veteran cross over to another State and claim an old-age pension in that State?

Well, he could not do so in my State. In Louisiana, to be eligible for old-age assistance, one must have resided in our State for 3 of the last 9 years with 1 full year immediately preceding date of application for old-age assistance. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will find that a majority of the States require similar residential qualifications. I am not critical of these requirements. They are laudatory for divers and obvious reasons.

Then what about income and property limitations?

Through thrift and industry in their younger years many old veterans have managed to pay for modest homes or small farms, but in order to obtain a Federal pension or compensation they are not required to liquidate their small estates. To be eligible for old-age assistance under State law, however, many of the States require the applicant to convey his real property to the State with certain provisions being made for a lifetime tenure by the surviving spouse. Nor may one dispose of his property for the immediate purpose of obtaining old-age assistance. In still other jurisdictions old-age-assistance payments automatically constitute a State lien on the recipient's property, both real and personal. All of these laws, for State purposes, are equally laudatory; but I submit that they were not enacted for the veteran class which served all the States and all the people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the half has not been told. Still another plan is being toyed with. This would place veterans—such as those of the war with Spain—under the Federal old-age and survivors-insurance plan. Although all of these old veterans had entered their declining years when the Federal Social Security Act was enacted, a few of them have built up small old-age and survivors-in-

surance credits which, for the most part, would not purchase a bare-subsistence existence. So to augment those inadequacies the payments would be increased out of the general old-age and survivors-insurance fund.

But how about the veteran or widow who has no such old-age and survivors-insurance credits?

Does it not naturally follow that they would have to be paid out of the old-age and survivors-insurance fund to which they have not contributed a cent? Would such use of this trust fund which is the lawful property of millions of working people be keeping faith with them? Under what due process of law could such expenditures be authorized? What are the great labor organizations going to say about it?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that the present Veterans' Administration hospital program is also under attack. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I assure the House that the whole program, with all of its ramifications, will be carefully evaluated with the best interest of the veteran always in mind.

Like George Washington, the veteran must be "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his fellow countrymen."

Exchanges of Persons Unite the Free World—Peace Depends on People Knowing People—No.1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when the House was debating the appropriations for the Division of Exchange of Persons in the Department of State, I took occasion to call to the attention of the Members the real need for funds for this important, positive program for world peace.

The House made a cut of \$10 million in the budget request, but the Senate restored the full amount, \$22 million, when it voted on the bill last week.

I would again like to reemphasize the value of this idea of working for peace by getting people acquainted on an international basis. I think that at this juncture of history, this nonmilitary peace offensive does much to enhance the position of the United States in world affairs.

The current issue of America carries an article by W. E. O'Brien which outlines how peace becomes more assured when we send our citizens abroad and bring foreign students, leaders, teachers, journalists, and other specialists here. The article is aptly titled "Peace Depends On People Knowing People."

This same issue of America has a very strong editorial pointing out the need for

favorable action in the House when the appropriation comes before us. I urge the members of the Appropriations Committee to give serious attention to the compelling arguments presented for restoration of these funds for the Exchange of Persons Division.

The editorial from America is included here for the information of my colleagues.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] have joined me in sponsoring legislation calling for increased attention to our American arts and cultures and providing for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. These bills would carry out some of the major proposals advanced recently by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., newspaper publisher, and General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America.

In his historic speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, Mr. Hearst pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. He went on to say that "preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence. The Western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front."

I am happy to be able to say here that a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee has just been appointed to hold hearings and study the legislation before it calling for distinguished civilian awards and cultural interchange and development. The members of the subcommittee are the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] as chairman, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLT], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and myself.

With the challenging proposals of Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff before us, proposals which have recently received the wholehearted support of Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, it is my hope that the hearings will be held quickly and that legislation meriting the support of my colleagues from both major parties will be reported to the floor in time for consideration by this Congress.

General Sarnoff had this to say in a letter which he addressed to me under date of May 25, 1955:

There is no doubt that we agree on the necessity for a strong political offensive in the cold war. And, as I wrote in my previous letter to you, I strongly favor study and consideration of all practical and constructive steps to further that offensive.

It seems to me that what General Sarnoff had to say in this memorandum to the President applies particularly to the exchange of persons program and the other cultural interchange programs—such as my bill, H. R. 5040, would implement. General Sarnoff said that one of the major problems facing the country today "is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity" of the programs "already being used, and often effectively."

The above-mentioned article follows:

EXCHANGES OF PERSONS UNITE THE FREE WORLD

Congress is now evaluating the United States exchange of persons program as a weapon in the world struggle for men's minds. W. E. O'Brien, administrative assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has done us the favor of writing "Peace depends on people knowing people" in this issue to explain why a great many well-informed Americans believe this program, instead of being slashed as the House has already voted to do, should now be enlarged.

The exchange of persons program grew principally out of two important pieces of postwar legislation. As early as 1946, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, a Democrat who is also a former Rhodes scholar and former president of the University of Arkansas, had the foresight to father a bill which provided funds for Americans to travel and engage in study and research abroad, and for foreign students to travel to and from the United States for the same purposes. Under the Fulbright Act funds (restricted to transportation, in the case of foreign students) came from the sale of United States surplus war property abroad.

In 1948, Senator MUNDT, a Republican and (among other activities) former college teacher, coauthored the much broader United States Information and Educational Exchange Act. Funds for this important weapon in the cold war came from annual dollar appropriations by Congress. The interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills part of this experiment, everyone seems to agree, has been notably successful.

Now what would happen to the exchange of persons program if the House axing of the requested \$22 million appropriation (including \$8.3 million in foreign currencies) to \$12 million (still including the foreign currencies) should become final?

Lopping off \$10 million of the actual dollar appropriation would, first of all, entirely cancel the proposed expansion of the program in the increasingly sensitive areas of the Middle East, the Far East, South Asia, and Africa. Worse still, it would even further reduce our already inadequate exchanges of persons with peoples in those regions. It would, in fact, just about annihilate the program, we understand, in 31 countries, such as Hong Kong and all Africa, except Egypt. New Fulbright programs planned for Formosa and Korea, two of the most strategic spots in the cold war, would be killed.

What impression would such a deemphasizing of our cultural-exchange policy make on people abroad? The President has asked Congress for \$40 billion for our own and foreign military defense in 1956. If we boggle at voting a mere \$14 million in dollars for the exchange of persons program, how can we answer the charge that we are relying far too exclusively on material means of defending freedom. We hope the House conferees yield to the Senate, which approved the \$22 million on May 31.

Exchanges of Persons Unite the Free World—Peace Depends on People Knowing People—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 the Senate approved intact the State Department's request for \$22 million to expand the exchange of persons program, which the House had cut to \$12 million.

Mr. W. E. O'Brien, administrative assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, explains in the June 11 issue of America magazine why the conferees meeting this week should provide generously for this important program.

During the debate in the House on April 14, 1955, on this program I said, in part:

I say that we are making a mistake if we withdraw from this very important activity—especially at a time when the Soviet Union is placing more and more emphasis on a stepped-up cultural offensive. It has been estimated that in 1953 the number of exchange visitors to the U. S. S. R. was more than 10,000 people. In addition, Soviet artists, scientists, dancers, musicians, and athletes are touring the world trying to create a picture of Soviet cultural superiority.

It is no secret that the men in the Kremlin are active in every section of the world where there may be opportunities for making ideological inroads. We are mistaken, I am sure, if we believe we can capture the hearts and minds of men with an overpowering military machine without giving the citizens of other nations a chance to observe us and to know us better.

Mr. O'Brien's article, *Peace Depends on People Knowing People*, follows:

PEACE DEPENDS ON PEOPLE KNOWING PEOPLE
(By W. E. O'Brien)

A new phase in the struggle to preserve world peace has set in. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND presaged its advent in his somber statement, interrupting the Senate's special session last November, on the atomic stalemate which he foresaw.

The rush of events this spring has largely confirmed the belief that the world has moved into a period of intensified nonmilitary competition between the Communist and free nations. It is, as the saying goes, a battle for men's minds. How decisive victories over men's minds can be was underlined at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia a couple of months ago. The courage and conviction with which leaders of non-Communist Asiatic peoples challenged the apologists for Red imperialism, masquerading as apostles of peace and anticolonialism, seems to have blunted the edge of Red China's ambitions to corral the uncommitted peoples of the Orient in its camp.

The Soviet Union's sudden agreement to an Austrian treaty, which came in the wake of the defeat of its drive to forestall West German membership in NATO, proved that Soviet policy has definitely shifted gears. Stalin's policy of antagonizing the free world at every turn had plainly backfired. The amazing buildup of anti-Communist military power, achieved through United States leadership, at least seems finally to have per-

sued the tacticians of aggressive Marxism that their bellicosity was heading them into a military showdown. Their new tactic is to muffle the drums of war and to rely on non-military political, economic, and propaganda measures to win the struggle of competitive coexistence with the forces of freedom.

This global shift in Communist tactics requires a reexamination of American foreign policy. Everyone is agreed that for us to drop our military guard would be to tumble into a Marxist trap. On the other hand, the time has come to go all out on nonmilitary phases of our foreign policy. Our military strength has erected a shield behind which we can compete against the Communist world for the deep-down allegiance of people's souls. The final outcome of the cold war will be decided largely by the success with which we carry through the nonmilitary phases of the postwar counteroffensive we have devised to prevent Marxists from enveloping any more peoples than they already have enveloped.

"EXCHANGE OF PERSONS" DIPLOMACY

One of the most important nonmilitary components of American foreign policy since the war has been our exchange of persons program. Under this, foreign students, teachers, journalists, social-welfare specialists, and other leading personalities have been invited to visit the United States as guests of our Government in order to become acquainted with typical American personalities and agencies doing the kind of work in which our guests are themselves engaged in their homelands. These are two-way programs, with properly qualified Americans enjoying a similar opportunity of visiting foreign lands at the expense of the United States Government for similar purposes.

During the past year 7,121 of these exchanges have been arranged. Two-thirds of the exchanges were foreigners invited to the United States to study, teach, lecture, carry on specialized research, or gain work experience. The other third were Americans who went abroad on the same types of mission.

The Department of State, which conducts these programs, calls attention to the fact that many of these exchanges were planned within the framework of projects to meet special situations in different countries. For example, a couple of years ago, Hispanic specialists in international law met in Latin America to promote the study of international law among the Spanish-speaking peoples of the world. Prof. Antonio de Luna, director of the Institute on the History of International Law at the University of Madrid, took a leading part in the discussions, emphasizing the natural-law basis of international law. The Madrid institute was named a center of the group's international project.

Dr. de Luna thereby attracted the attention of officials in the Exchange of Persons Program, who promptly invited him to visit this country in order to see for himself how American universities went about the study and teaching of international law. As a result of his visit, Dr. de Luna has agreed to join the faculty of a large American Catholic university as a visiting professor. No doubt he will contribute toward a much better understanding between the people of the United States and those of Spain and other Hispanic countries. In such concrete ways the peoples of the free world can come to understand each other much better. This common understanding of one another, of course, is essential to greater cooperation between various nations in the achieving of stable, peaceful relations between them.

HISTORY AND STATUS OF THE PROGRAMS

The postwar exchange of persons program has its legislative roots principally in the Fulbright Act of 1946, the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, and a number of other legis-

lative measures setting up special exchange programs with Latin American countries, China, Korea, Finland, Iran, Germany, Austria, and India. These special authorizations met special needs in sensitive areas of the world where international problems of high priority challenged our ingenuity. The programs are financed both through congressional appropriations in dollars and through the use of money that we have at our disposal in foreign currencies. These are funds which foreign governments credited to our Government from the sale of surplus war materials abroad. Under the Fulbright Act the United States Government can assign these funds to support Americans we send abroad to study or carry out other purposes of this phase of the exchange program.

There are Federal cultural-interchange programs outside those run by the Department of State, but our present interest lies in these latter. The proposed appropriation for continuation of the Department's exchange of persons program under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts for the fiscal year 1956 is \$22 million, of which \$8.3 would be in foreign currencies. This is an increase of \$6.5 million over the present year's appropriation, largely to cover the costs of exchanges with the Middle East, Far East, south Asia, and Africa as recommended by congressional committees, Vice President Nixon, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and others.

Instead of expanding the program, the House cut the appropriation from \$22 million to \$12 million, of which \$8 million must still be in foreign currencies. This would leave only \$4 million for activities costing dollars and for the administration of the entire program. The Senate on May 31 approved the \$22 million intact. The two bills were to be ironed out in conference this week.

It is important to note that private groups supplement the facilities provided by the Federal Government in carrying out these programs. Last year, for example, it is estimated that at least \$7.8 million was contributed in this way from nongovernmental sources. This contribution helped to defray the costs of 450 projects involving 3,400 exchanges of persons.

VALUABLE RESULTS ACHIEVED

What evidence have we which would prove that the exchange of persons program in its various phases has actually achieved its purpose of creating better understanding and a greater spirit of friendliness between Americans and other free peoples? In answering this question we must distinguish between the short-range and long-range phases of this experiment. It is too soon to judge of the long-range results. The younger people from foreign lands who have had the opportunity to visit the United States were selected because of the promise they gave of rising in influence at home as their careers unfolded. In most cases they have not yet had time to achieve much influence.

But we can tell from the good results of the short-range phases that the experiment is achieving its purposes. For example, nearly every one of the Asiatics of real prominence who spoke up at the Bandung Conference in defense of the peaceful purposes of United States foreign policy and in condemnation of the aggressive purposes of Red expansionism has been educated in one of the Western countries. In fact, the Bandung Conference went on record in favor of international exchanges of persons by adopting a resolution declaring that "the most powerful means of promoting understanding among nations is the development of cultural cooperation."

Last November, at the meeting of the National Council of Catholic Women in Boston, President Eisenhower testified that the exchange programs are "increasing intercultural understanding and thereby forging the

bonds of brotherhood and good will among men. They are thus serving the cause of peace in a troubled world." Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON recently told the Senate Appropriations Committee that his "look-see" tours through Asia and Latin America had proven to him the effectiveness of these exchanges. "If I had to pick one program in the foreign field which was the most effective," he said, "if I had to pick one that was indispensable, this would be it."

A survey by the Bureau of Social Science Research of American University, Washington, D. C., reported that foreign students, after visiting the United States, were favorably impressed by their experience. They thought Americans were "cordial, warm, kind, and hospitable * * * and that this was experienced as quite a surprise." The same survey indicated that foreign students credit us with a high cultural level and strong attachment to noneconomic values. In other words, their experiences here had caused them to revise the stereotype distant peoples often have of Americans as a money-mad breed of vulgar tastes.

A survey which the Department of State itself conducted of about 1,000 returned grantees in 17 foreign countries showed that the majority of them after returning home had engaged in activities favorable to the purposes which the United States is pursuing in the world at large. This was particularly true of our foreign policy, of which the visitors acquired a much better understanding during their stay with us.

Ranbir Singh, editor of the Daily Milap of New Delhi, the capital of India, has gone on record about the way his visit to America changed his attitude toward us. He said that his impressions of Americans previous to his visit—impressions gained mostly from American movies and Communist propaganda—were that most Americans were either crooks or millionaires or both. On our home grounds, however, he found Americans to be neither, but friendly and kind, much like the folks he knew at home. Mr. Singh makes as many as nine talks a day to various groups in India. The newspaper he edits is full of accurate information about us and his editorials are friendly. This kind of offset to the malicious anti-American propaganda Soviet agents pour into India is invaluable to the cause of freedom and peace.

Dr. Elizabeth Burger, counselor in the Catholic Church's women's-affairs program in Germany, has informed almost a million Germans, through her magazine articles and lectures, about her impressions of America. She keeps insisting on the fact that, though the New York skyline is picketed by skyscrapers instead of church spires, as in Europe, it is a mistake to minimize the importance of religion in the United States.

Our diplomats abroad who see the exchange programs in operation overseas are enthusiastic witnesses to its value. United States ambassadors polled on the subject agreed with Mr. Nixon's estimate: "This exchange of persons is our most effective program abroad."

Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who has had considerable experience with these programs, wrote to the Senate Appropriations Committee urging continuance of this experiment.

Finally, we know how important the Kremlin regards its own exchange programs as weapons in its cold war against freedom. All the key people in the Guatemala revolt, according to Mr. Nixon's check, had been sent either to Russia or to Iron Curtain countries to study.

MINOR CRITICISMS

One criticism of the exchange-of-persons program is that enough foreign students come to the United States to study (30,000

in 1954) without our paying their way. The answer is that the Department of State selects young foreigners of proven competence and could get many more from the sensitive areas. It gives preference to those who are particularly interested in such subjects as American history, the social sciences and law and studies which will enable them to promote the well-being of their own people through engineering, medicine, and social welfare. The ability of foreign students to come here without our help depends on many circumstances which have no relevance to the purposes of this special program such as the financial standing of their parents.

Another criticism is that we do not need to make more friends in already friendly countries. In view of the ingenuity of the Soviet Union and Red China in creating friction between us and our allies, this criticism hardly carries much weight. We cannot have too many or too well-informed friends in foreign countries. Besides, who knows whether the younger persons now working their ways toward positions of leadership abroad will be friendly to us when they wield great influence within a few years?

UNWISE ECONOMY

The desire of Congress to economize is always understandable. Before accepting such a deep cut as the House has approved, however, proponents of the program hope the Senate will carefully weigh the value of the particular phases of it which will suffer most. When we consider it a bargain to be able, by multiplying orders, to build a single intercontinental B-52 jet bomber for \$8 million, is it wise to refuse less than 3 times that amount to continue in full force for another year our best weapon in the battle for men's minds? For in the end, as the Bandung Conference must have convinced us, it is what the peoples of the world think that will decide who wins and who loses the cold war. Why take chances on losing that battle merely to save a few million dollars?

Our Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very able speech delivered by the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, majority whip of the House of Representatives, at the occasion of the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington recently. Congressman ALBERT has a fluency and a style in delivering a speech that is enviable, and I am sure our Members would like to read his speech on this occasion.

The speech follows:

GREETINGS TO THE 42d NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT, OKLAHOMA

Mr. President, it is with great pride that I appear here to bring a word of greeting from my colleagues in the Congress. I am proud that this great organization is presided over by one of my most able and distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks]. No Member of the Congress and no person in or out of Congress has worked more diligently or more effectively for the development of the

rivers and harbors of this Nation than my good friend, OVERTON BROOKS. I am happy to be on the program with the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, one of the great Americans of our time. I am happy to have been able to have served in the House with LYNDON JOHNSON and to have his valuable friendship many years ago. It is a pleasure to be on the platform with the distinguished Republican whip of the Senate, Senator SALTONSTALL, and with my able and affable colleague of the House, SM SIMPSON, who is also my colleague on the Committee on Agriculture. No one has worked harder than SM on questions of flood control, navigation, and conservation. I join all these colleagues of mine from both Houses of Congress in extending greetings from all Members of Congress to your great organization which is devoted to the development of America for the American people. I would probably leave a better impression with all of you if I merely said amen to what my colleagues have already said and sat down.

I have favored all phases of all programs designed to conserve water and soil. I have supported projects in all sections of the country aimed at controlling the ravages of flood and opening up of our waterways for the benefit of man. Conservation of water, conservation of soil, recreation, hydroelectric power, flood control, irrigation—these are things we cannot afford not to do.

We are not a Nation of agricultural surpluses, and what a blessing that is. Yet we can already see over the tops of these surpluses to a time which is not far distant when we are going to be a Nation of agricultural deficits unless we increase our productive capacity. I am proud of the steps being taken along this line in my own State. We are developing upstream flood control in the Washita Basin in a manner and on a scale that will be a model for this Nation. We are thus expanding the breadbasket of our State. This is one of the methods open to the Nation as a whole to meet the challenge which an ever-expanding population is going to place before American agriculture. I not only favor developing and utilizing our great rivers. I want to see every creek watershed in the country and every small river watershed in the country developed and controlled. I want to see dams on the tributaries as well as on the great streams of our land.

Mr. President, I favor the development of the great watersheds of the West for irrigation and reclamation and power. I have driven across our great Western States and have observed the tremendous productive capacity of desert wastelands once it is touched by water. This is one of our great food and fiber reservoirs of the future. But we cannot wait until the future to proceed with their development. We must begin now in order to finish the job in time to meet certain demands of tomorrow.

I favor flood control in the eastern and central sections of our country as I favor reclamation and irrigation in the arid West. In all sections of our country, water, which can be a dangerous enemy, must be harnessed and made the obedient servant of man.

Recreation is not the smallest aspect of our water development program. More and more of our people are leaving the farms every year and going into the cities. The small towns are becoming smaller and the large cities larger. We need more open-air recreation for our growing industrial population.

So, Mr. President, I join my colleagues in all they have said to your membership. You are to be congratulated on being the oldest and most active national organization designed to build up the river and harbor resources of our country. These things are for America. They will serve us well in peace or war. They are indispensable to the future greatness of our country.

Republican Cadillac Cabinet Adopts Public-Be-Damned Attitude in Awarding Antilabor Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department and other Federal departments and agencies have taken the position that there is no authority in the law for refusing to award a contract to a low bidder solely because of his violation of Federal labor law. Their position is supported, in fact, by findings of the Comptroller General that contracting agencies cannot consider such facts as compliance with the National Labor Relations Act in awarding Government contracts.

While it is entirely proper for the Federal Government to remain neutral in labor disputes where both parties are exercising their rights in conformance with the law, this policy has no basis in fact where one party to a labor dispute has been found by an appropriate tribunal to be in violation of the law. It is clear that barring from Government contracts those companies which have been found to be in violation of the National Labor Relations Act is surely as much in the national interest as denying contracts to those companies which have paid sums of money to Federal employees and contract officers to influence them in the granting of such contracts. It is not a position which can be represented as favoring labor over management.

To do otherwise would be to place employers who do obey the law at a competitive disadvantage by rewarding violators of the law who may be able to underbid their competitors exactly because of their unfair labor practices.

True to the big-business complexion of the present administration and its "Cadillac philosophy" the Department of Defense takes the position that its procurement agencies must remain neutral in labor disputes. What sort of neutrality is it when a Federal department awards a Federal contract to a violator of the Federal law? The Comptroller General interprets the law to mean that contracts must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, but how can a company which has been found to be in violation of the law by one Federal agency be considered by another Federal agency to be responsible.

Last winter, when the L. A. Young Co., in Trenton, N. J., and its employees needed a Federal contract to keep the doors open, the Department of Defense awarded a \$2 million contract for shell cases to the Kohler Co., of Wisconsin, despite the fact that the NLRB found that the Kohler Co. engaged in unfair labor practices, including several acts of illegal interference during an NLRB-supervised election campaign, restraint and coercion, and discrimination.

I am joining today with Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY and the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] in introducing a bill which will prohibit Government agencies from awarding contracts to companies which have been found guilty of an unfair labor practice by the National Labor Relations Board where the violation remains unremedied.

It is a moderate bill, Mr. Speaker, which asks only that companies found guilty of violation of Federal law and of the labor relations policy established by Congress and which persist in such practices be denied Government contracts. This, surely, is a reasonable proposal since it seeks only that the Federal Government shall not reward violators of the law.

United States Air Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that a statement by him on the subject "Our Air Force Must Be the Best," together with a statement from the Boeing Airplane Co., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

There is only one way the United States can achieve and maintain air superiority—that is, by inventing new ways to do new things faster and better. This, in turn, means research and development.

Research of that sort is being carried on at the moment by many great American aviation companies, and one of the leaders is Boeing Aircraft Co., makers of the B-52, which is performing so well for our Strategic Air Command.

The past 10 days have seen our Defense Department make a complete about-face. Finally, that agency decided that the production of B-52's will be stepped up \$300 million, or 35 percent. This will give us more striking power in being. It, however, does not go to the root of the problem.

If Russia has overtaken us or outstripped us in air power, the obvious question is: "Why has this unhappy state of affairs occurred?"

The answer: "The civilian leaders in the Defense Establishment and the administration have not recognized, and still do not recognize, the basic cause of our weakness."

It takes trained manpower—scientists and engineers—to perform research and development—but what is the record?

One example testifies to the attitude of the defense and administration planners on trained manpower. The National Science Foundation, for 1956, requested \$22,716,000 for support of basic research. The President's budget clipped this by \$4,384,000.

That is a small sum relatively, but it knocked in the head the opportunity to train 1,300 scientists.

Here's another example that goes to the heart of our weakness: In fiscal 1953 we spent \$1.41 billion on research and development of new weapons; in fiscal 1955 we will spend \$1.30 billion. As the race gets faster—as the threat of Russian air superiority gets

greater—expenditures are slashed at the point where it hurts most.

In all this it is heartening to know that the dollars—even though slashed severely by the administration—that are spent in aircraft production are buying as much as is humanly possible at this point to produce.

In this regard I cite a statement just received from Boeing Aircraft Co.:

"HOW DO BOEING METHODS HELP ACHIEVE 'MORE AIR FORCE PER DOLLAR'?"

"Living in the atomic age, we find that each year makes certain facts stand out in sharper relief.

"The first such fact, now grasped by all thinking Americans, is that the power to inflict terrible destruction on an enemy is no longer ours alone. We know that nuclear weapons have been produced by the Soviets. We know, too, that the U. S. S. R. has aircraft capable of delivering them. Therefore, the major deterrent to war is now, and must continue to be, the superiority of our own air arm.

"At the same time it is clear that a free nation cannot afford to cripple its economy by wasting any of the billions of dollars being spent to maintain air superiority.

"A DOUBLE RESPONSIBILITY"

"The Boeing Airplane Company, as a principal supplier of Strategic Air Command planes, has a double responsibility to the public.

"Our first duty is to build the world's most potent bombers and refueling tankers. In doing so we are making weapons for the defense of our country. The consequences of producing aircraft that would place second in the event of international conflict would be unthinkable.

"That is why the Boeing tradition of achieving the utmost in quality is more important today than ever before. Not only our management but all of our nearly 65,000 employees are imbued with the idea of building the best that can be built. Research, design, and engineering all contribute to that objective.

"The company's second and equally vital responsibility is to deliver its products to the Air Force at the lowest possible cost.

"'MORE AIR FORCE PER DOLLAR'"

"That meaningful phrase is a slogan of the Air Materiel Command. And helping to make it a fact is one of Boeing's permanent objectives.

"Efficient production is as deeply ingrained in this organization as the urge to build well. It was demonstrated during World War II, in the steadily lowered costs of the B-17 Flying Fortress and the B-29 Superfortress. More recently the constant drive for efficiency has broken records in reducing the number of man-hours needed to produce the B-47 Stratojet bomber and the KC-97 tanker. As a result, many millions of dollars have been returned to the United States Treasury.

"Saving dollars for the taxpayer starts with the design of the aircraft itself. It follows through the planning and setting up of tools and jigs for fast, smooth-flowing production. It is inherent in Boeing's constant emphasis on manufacturing efficiency throughout the production life of the airplane. It is supplemented by workers' suggestions for process improvement—for which scores of cash awards are made each month. Finally it is highlighted by an extreme cost consciousness throughout the ranks of Boeing management.

"MANAGEMENT TRAINING PAYS OFF"

"Primary among Boeing's policies is the building of an ever-stronger management team. In an industry producing mechanisms of growing complexity the manager's role of channeling skills for maximum effectiveness takes on more and more importance. For that reason thorough training is a must for every man at the management level.

Boeing has established programs ranging from a 40-hour course for supervisors to 6-week university courses for men in higher positions.

"These training programs, along with Boeing's continuing emphasis on efficiency and effective long-range planning, are paying off every day. They are playing a large part in giving America more and better airplanes at lower cost—helping to reach the goal of 'More Air Force per dollar.'

"BOEING AIRPLANE Co."

Postal Service—Historical Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

POSTAL SERVICE—HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Member of Congress, Sixth District of Iowa)

The story of postal service is a fascinating tale. It goes back to the earliest days of recorded history. It covers every civilized country of the globe. It utilizes nearly every means of transport. It is used by princes and potentates—and by the humblest citizen. It is the willing and economical servant of great business enterprise and carries messages of affection between lovers. Every phase of modern life enjoys its indispensable service, and receives the benefits of its rapid communication. No instrumentality of our Government comes so close to all our people, and no other serves them so intimately and well.

You who read this, the Iowa post-office employees, honor me to admit me to your company for a few minutes. You share in a most important enterprise. Your work is an indispensable link in a nationwide and worldwide chain of communication joining every citizen with every other.

The predecessor of what has become our modern postal service amounted to nothing more than a messenger service. It existed solely for the transmission of Government orders and messages. There are examples of this type of communication back to the beginnings of recorded history. All early civilizations in all parts of the world made use of the post to some degree. Just as now, it was a vital service. An ancient ruler of the Far East once stated that his government rested on four pillars: His police, his judge, his finance, and his posts. So does our Government today—and the post office is essential.

It remained a courier service until quite late in history. Then, during the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, A. D., there came a transition period. The purely Government postal service was opened to the public.

Several factors made personal communications necessary. First was the increased use of paper. Second was the introduction of the printing press. Third was the increased literacy among the people. Fourth was the increasing growth of business and commercial enterprises, with a growing practice of trading abroad.

EUROPEAN BACKGROUND

One early phase of the transition occurred when the University of Paris arranged for the employment of foot messengers to carry communications from its thousands of students back to their homes, many of whom came from foreign lands. It has been sug-

gested that the students, then, just as now, needed some quick and efficient way of sending home for money. At first the messengers were in the exclusive service of the students and teachers. History reports that as time passed the messengers began to carry letters and do errands for people with no connection to the university.

Another step in the transition toward a public service had its origin in the business world. During the latter part of the 13th century the merchants of the Hanseatic League in northern Germany organized a courier service to assist their commercial activities. Later it became customary for traveling trades people to carry letters for others. Gradually a fixed compensation for this service became established.

Historical accounts differ as to the exact beginning of the modern postal service. One historian says the first true public post began with the service originated by the family of the house of Thurn and Taxis of Germany. On March 1, 1500, Philip I, son of Maximilian, appointed Francis von Taxis, "Captain and Master of our Posts."

The historian states:

"Francis' post service ran according to schedule, but the royal treasury presently found it impossible to pay the yearly stipend due him. The resourceful postman * * * demanded that he be permitted to carry passengers and private letters in order to reimburse himself; and this privilege was granted him, provided that he did not allow it to interfere with the speed of the royal dispatches."

The year 1516 marks the beginning of the great Imperial German Post of later centuries.

IN ENGLAND

In England the earliest postal service likewise existed solely for the use of the government. King John, who reigned during the opening years of the 13th century, is the first recorded English monarch to retain a staff of messengers. Activities of the early English post included the maintenance of relays of horses at selected points for the use of persons traveling on official government business.

The transition to a public postal service in England was gradual, taking place throughout the 17th century. The act of 1657 established a schedule of rates. For letters the rate was 2 pence for distances up to 80 miles, and for packets, 8 pence per ounce. Persons riding "in post" were to be charged 2½ pence per mile.

IN AMERICA

Postal activities in the United States date back over 300 years. The first occurred at Boston on November 5, 1639, when the General Court of Massachusetts declared that the tavern of Richard Fairbanks would be the official repository for mail. The act provided for foreign mail only.

The first scheduled transportation of mail between the colonies was inaugurated January 22, 1673. At that time Gov. Francis Lovelace of New York dispatched a mail courier for Boston, following what is now U. S. Route 1, still known as the Boston Post Road. This started as a regular monthly service. Due to wars with the Indians and the Dutch, intercolonial communication was interrupted and the service ended after only a few months.

During the early years of colonization the English King had exhibited interest only in ventures which promised to yield a definite profit. By 1690 the population had grown to 214,000, and a postal system appeared to have moneymaking possibilities.

The King then granted full monopoly rights to Thomas Neale, of London, for the purpose of setting up a postal system in the colonies. Instead of being profitable the venture lost money. But it had several desirable effects. First, it brought about greater unity among the colonies. Second, it

aided the development of the postal system and of communications. And third, it gave emphasis to the growing belief that handling and transporting the mails should be a responsibility of Government rather than of individuals.

But the postal rates were high, and the service was slow and unreliable. Worst of all, the King claimed for his postal officials the right to open and read all letters, thereby destroying all privacy of the mails.

In the year 1753, Benjamin Franklin was appointed the Postmaster General. His first major act was to make an extensive tour of inspection during which he visited all stations in the North and as far south as Virginia. During the tour he took careful note of deficiencies in the service.

Since the rates were set by the King, Franklin lacked the power to lower them even though they were excessive. He therefore devoted his attention to making improvements in the service itself. New surveys were made resulting in new and shorter routes. He speeded up all routes, old and new, and increased the frequency of trips. Mail between New York and Philadelphia was put on a day-and-night basis, which meant that henceforth this mail would travel at night.

Under his guidance the service became more dependable and the use increased. Franklin's outstanding contribution to the postal service was his demonstration that more and better service results in greater use, which in turn results in greater revenues.

For the first 4 years of operation under Franklin's administration the post office showed a deficit. But for the second 4-year period he was able to report a surplus for the entire 8 years of nearly 500 pounds. When this surplus was sent to England it created quite a stir among British authorities as the first sum received from the colonial post office. Annual surpluses were enjoyed by the service in subsequent years: for 1773-74 it amounted to 3,000 pounds.

But Franklin's sympathies were entirely for the colonies in the years preceding the American Revolution. The consequence was that in 1774 he was removed from his post with the service by the British. His dismissal foreshadowed the coming break of the colonies with England.

The post office played an important part in the American Revolution. First, the postal system proved to be the best means of exchanging news, information, and official Government intelligence. Accordingly it helped greatly to unite the colonies, to establish common goals, and to coordinate and concentrate their activities. Second, the act of sending surplus revenues over to the King greatly irritated the colonists. Third, the dismissal of Franklin was regarded by the colonists generally as a seizure of their postal system by their oppressors.

One of the important accomplishments of the Continental Congress was the adoption in July 1775 of the Post Office Act which established, for the first time, an American postal system. It consisted of a line of posts from Falmouth, Maine, to Savannah, Ga. The rates were to be 20 percent below those of the older system. Franklin was named as the Postmaster General at a salary of \$1,000 per year. For the rest of that year there were two postal systems in operation side by side—one American and one British. The New York Committee of Safety wrote that "the constitutional post office is now rising on the ruins of the parliamentary one, which is just expiring in convulsions." The English system ceased operations on December 25, 1775, less than a year before July 4, 1776, our Independence Day.

POSTAL SYSTEM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

While our Federal Constitution was being formulated, due regard and consideration were given to a postal system. Many plans were offered. In keeping with the brevity of

the entire document, the Constitution provided that:

"The Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads."

The statement was brief, but the intent is unmistakable. To the National Government went the exclusive power to establish and administer a postal system.

On September 26, 1789, President Washington appointed Samuel Osgood of Massachusetts Postmaster General, the first to be appointed to the post under the new Government.

The following year our young Nation covered an area of about 500,000 square miles, and had a population of nearly 4 million persons. There were 75 post offices throughout the country connected by 1,875 miles of post roads. For the year, 266,000 letters were handled, and total receipts came to \$37,935, of which \$5,795 was surplus.

For 40 years the postal service was a part of the Treasury Department. That year there were 8,050 post offices, serving 12 million people connected by 115,000 miles of post roads. The Post Office Department handled nearly 14 million letters in 1830. However, the service was still slow. The only means of transportation available were horseback, stagecoach, and water. In some remote regions mail was carried on foot.

1830 marks the coming of the railroad and faster transportation. It was the beginning of a new era of economic development. The postal service both aided and benefited by the transportation revolution. It took at least 20 hours to cover the distance between Washington, D. C., and Philadelphia by stagecoach; the railroads reduced this time to 6 hours. Congress took due notice of the railroads and declared every railroad to be a post road, giving them full status as carriers of the Nation's mail. By 1851 mail was being transported on 10,000 miles of railroads.

Postal officials were not entirely satisfied with the speed of early rail service. The trains ran only during the day. The Post Office insisted that the trains continue on at night. There was an established precedent of nearly 100 years standing for such an argument—Franklin, in his reforms of the Colonial service during the 1750's, had ordered night movements of the mails. The railroads countered with the protests that night movements of trains would be hazardous. However, the Department refused to yield, and night train service became general.

Meanwhile the frontier was being extended westward. Wherever people went postal service followed. In New Salem, Ill., a postmaster was appointed on May 7, 1833. His name was Abraham Lincoln, age 24; politics, Whig. His post office was located in the store which he owned jointly with his partner. It is said that he carried the letters around in his hat, delivering them as he had the opportunity. Such deliveries occasionally took him out into the country—a sort of rural free delivery on a very irregular basis. The mail arrived anywhere from semiweekly to biweekly, and the volume was never great enough to make his duties arduous or lucrative.

Three years after his appointment the New Salem office was discontinued by the Post Office Department because of lack of business. But Lincoln had since been elected to the legislature and did not mind his dismissal. When Lincoln served in the United States Congress he was a member of the Post Office Committee of the House.

The next big development in the postal service came on March 3, 1847, when Congress authorized the Postmaster General to issue the first postage stamps. It is hard to believe that the use of postage stamps is just about 108 years old. They were first placed on sale in New York City on July 1, 1847. The use of postage stamps simplified the labors of the postal workers. It greatly in-

creased the efficiency of the postal service. You will recall that prior to the use of stamps the postage was generally collected from the recipient rather than the sender of the mail.

The act of 1851 marks the beginning of a new era for the Post Office Department. Henceforth, public service was to be the guiding force of the system. The act provided greatly reduced rates, establishing the 3-cent rate for distances up to 3,000 miles. The distance factor controlling rates on first-class mail was completely removed in 1863.

Soon the Postmaster General was able to establish several mail routes to the Pacific coast. Unquestionably it was a wise policy to aid the settling of the great western lands through the maintenance of vital communication links.

No summary of the development of our postal service would be complete without some reference to the pony express. It is one of the most romantic chapters of the history of America.

The first pony express left St. Joseph, Mo., on April 3, 1860. Ten days later the run was completed at San Francisco, cutting the usual travel time in half. The route was nearly 2,000 miles long. It touched Salt Lake City, Carson City, and Sacramento. The route was served by 190 stations where the riders received fresh horses. There were 80 riders, the most famous of whom was Buffalo Bill Cody. The company used over 400 horses; the best that could be found. The service was inaugurated on a weekly basis but it was soon increased to two trips a week. It was a private venture, backed by the funds of private individuals, and it was extremely popular among the early western settlers.

The pony express lasted only 16 months. The high cost of operating the service exceeded the amount of revenue obtained. In addition, the transcontinental telegraph system was completed in October 1861, making the pony express unnecessary and uneconomical. Also the Civil War intervened. Even though the pony express lasted a little more than 1 year, it made an indelible mark on the history of postal communications, and on the history of the Nation. While it existed it served a vital purpose—the establishment of a faster line of communication between the people of the East and those of the West.

MODERN MAIL SERVICE

Another important chapter in the development of the postal service is the establishment of airmail. Experimental airmail services were conducted at Long Island in September 1911. Regular service dates from May 15, 1918, when the War Department furnished pilots and planes for flights between Washington, D. C., and New York City. After August 18, 1918, the Post Office Department took over the operations of air mail service.

By September 1920 we were flying the mail from coast to coast. But the planes did not fly at night. Here was the same problem which had confronted postal authorities on at least two past occasions—an unwarranted delay of the mail. Such a condition could not be squared with the Post Office creed that "the mail must go through." Accordingly, the Post Office Department again was a prime mover in introducing night operations—this time in the field of aviation. On February 22, 1921, the first transcontinental flight took off from the Pacific coast bearing mail. Thirty-three and one-half hours later the flight was completed at Hazelhurst Field, Long Island. Night flying was proven to be practical. A new era for postal service, and for all transportation had been ushered in. The speed of the airmail service is phenomenal. I myself received a letter in Johannesburg, South Africa only 4 days after it was mailed on the west coast of the United States.

Another modern development of postal transportation is the use of motortrucks for

intercity movements of the mail. Such use has been developing gradually over a long period. But recently it has taken its place as an important means of the mail transportation. The truck is quick, versatile, dependable, and it can deliver its load at the post office door. Department officials predict that greater use will be made of trucks in the future.

The newest phase of mail transportation is the use of helicopters in crowded metropolitan centers to get mail from the airports on the outskirts of a city to the post office in the downtown area. Once again the Post Office Department is pioneering a useful means of transportation.

VAST SERVICES TODAY

As you know so well, today the Post Office Department has grown into a vast service institution working day and night. It reaches out to every person in the Nation, supplying them with the vital service of communications. It acts as the link between the Nation's citizens and their Federal Government; between members of families who are separated, and between friends who have occasion to correspond. It is a link between business concerns and their customers. It is a service which millions of Americans take advantage of every day. It is remarkable how much service is offered for the ridiculously low amount of 3 cents. A first-class letter at 3 cents postage is the best bargain there is in America.

I need not tell you that the mail is divided into several classes. Letters and post cards are considered first class mail and receive priority treatment. Magazines and newspapers constitute the bulk of second class mail, while third class mail consists of merchandise and other matter. Fourth class is parcel post. Airmail is the fifth great class of mail.

It is illuminating to contrast the size of the present operations with those of the past. One hundred years ago the Department was handling about 85 million pieces of mail or roughly about 4 pieces for each person. In 1953 the Post Office Department handled the staggering total of 51 billion pieces, weighing over 11 billion pounds, and amounting to 305 pieces of mail for every inhabitant of the United States of America.

The list of various services performed by the Post Office Department is long and impressive. City delivery service, collection on delivery, commemorative stamps, free delivery for the blind, insured mail, internal revenue stamps, money order service, postage stamps and stamped cards, postal savings, registered mail, rural delivery service, savings bonds and stamps, special delivery service, and star route service.

Important as these services are, the public is prone to take them for granted. Each activity of the Department listed here has an interesting history. Here is a brief mention as reported to me by the Department.

The first new service, other than the introduction of stamps, was the establishment of the registry system in 1855. This was done to afford greater security in sending money and valuables through the mail.

In 1858 street boxes were introduced so that postal patrons would not have to go to the post office to mail letters.

Free delivery of mail was inaugurated in 49 cities in 1863. There were 440 carriers so employed for the first year, and the cost amounted to \$300,000.

Up until 1861 all mail carried on trains was distributed in post offices. In that year the postmaster at St. Joseph, Mo., tried out a method of sorting mail on a moving train by route agents between Hannibal and St. Joseph in an attempt to avoid delays in mail departures for the West. The experiment was successful. In 1864 the first officially sponsored test of a railway post office car was made on August 28 between Chicago and Clinton, Iowa. On December 22 of that year

the Post Office Department appointed a deputy in charge of railway post offices and railway mails. This marked the beginning of railway mail service.

In 1864 the money order system was inaugurated. The service was placed in operation in 139 post offices, mainly to accommodate members of the Union Army who desired to send their money home. Money order service was extended to countries abroad in 1867.

Postal cards were first used in 1873. In 1885 the special delivery service was established to accommodate patrons who wanted prompt delivery of mail upon receipt at the post office. One million special deliveries were made the first year.

One of the most far-reaching developments was the inauguration of rural free delivery on October 1, 1896. On that date five routes were placed in operation in West Virginia. During the first week, patrons on the routes selected received 214 letters, 290 newspapers, 33 postal cards, and 2 packages. Today there are over 32,500 rural routes serving approximately 35 million people.

The postal savings system was established in 1911 as a convenient and safe depository for the accumulation of savings and to encourage thrift. Originally the maximum that could be placed in a postal savings account was \$500. Today the maximum is \$2,500.

One of the most widely used services today—the parcel post, was inaugurated in 1913. An early result of the service was a greatly increased exchange of farm products and goods between the rural and urban areas. Parcel post has contributed much to the economic and cultural advancement of the country. The Post Office Department handles more than one and a quarter billion pieces of parcel post matter annually. Insurance and collection-on-delivery services also were instituted during 1913.

FOREIGN MAIL

Today our postal system reaches to every corner of the earth. International postal service actually dates back to 1639. From that date until 1862 a number of agreements were made with foreign governments covering the international exchange of mail. But the general condition of international service was unsatisfactory.

In 1862 Postmaster General Montgomery Blair suggested a conference of interested nations for the purpose of formulating principles which would bring about greater order and uniformity. The following year the representatives of 15 countries met at Paris and adopted 31 principles designed to govern and improve international postal relations. These principles were the nucleus for the first treaty concerning the formation of a General Postal Union.

The first postal congress was held at Berne, Switzerland, in 1874, during which the treaty of the General Postal Union was concluded. The adoption of the treaty resulted in various postal reforms and improvements, including uniformity in rates and in regulations, a general reduction of rates, and the removal of many barriers to international postal communication.

In 1878 the name was changed to Universal Postal Union. Congresses of the Union are held every 5 years to consider necessary revisions. There is another postal union known as the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, which represents the countries of North, Central, and South America and Spain.

Postal rates and services in the United States compare very favorably with rates and services abroad. And no other country handles anywhere near the 305 pieces of mail per capita handled by our own postal organization.

POSTAL WORKERS

You whom I address know so much better than I the scope and magnitude of our

postal services. But to my mind the most important element of the postal system is the people who make it come alive and function, the group of which you are a part. There are well over 500,000 postal workers whose home bases are 41,000 post offices located throughout the land. They carry, distribute, and deliver the vast volume of our mail and perform the innumerable services of the post office.

As postal workers they are important because they are the ones who represent their Federal Government at the everyday level of Americans everywhere. The average citizen rarely sees the President or Vice President of the United States, but most persons do see the postman frequently; nearly every day. Thus he becomes the ambassador of the Government in thousands of post offices and on thousands of delivery routes through the country. At the same time he is a faithful and dependable servant of the people.

Accordingly, at home the postal employee should be treated with the consideration and respect due the members of so vital a group. You are and should be members of your communities. Your calling is a high and honorable one—a truly public and patriotic service. You are dedicated to the performance of an important duty.

We in Congress, who represent not only the postal workers but all the Nation's people in the Capitol at Washington should never lose sight of the importance of this great group of devoted public servants who handle the Nation's mail. Certainly if the home front is indebted to you, by the same token the Congress is also under deep and lasting obligation, and it should make every effort to treat you fairly and generously.

For my own part I have tried in every proper way to recognize the splendid contribution made by our postal workers to the national welfare. You have had, and so long as I continue to serve the people in the Congress, will have my earnest and conscientious support and vote.

The Work of the Commission on Reorganization of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a copy of an address made by former President Herbert Hoover on Thursday evening, May 19, 1955, before the national industrial conference board and over a national radio hookup entitled, "The Work of the Commission on Reorganization of the Government".

Your committee of this conference toward better government asked me to review the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government up to now.

I wish to read you three passages from the revised edition of Aesop's Fables.

Once upon a time complications happened in the government and the young doctors were called in. They gave all the verbal injections for the viruses and the verbal antibiotics for balancing the budget. Yet the budget did not balance. So, the old family doctor was called in for consultation. He thumped about a bit and came up with

an idea. He said, take two antiwaste pills every morning and night.

But the patients all moaned and said, "But, Doctor, that will destroy our morale."

The second fable is:

One upon a time a mere citizen-reformer tried to quickly reform a political mind. But, he said, "You don't know the art of being a reformer. Reforms begin after the next election."

The third fable is:

Once upon a time the Commission on Reorganization of the Government said some restraining words affecting 1 of the 1,000 pressure groups represented in Washington. That pressure group said, "We deeply respect your words. But it is only the other 999 pressure groups that are badly in need of reform and we will help you." They said our appropriations are very necessary. Our Commission opined that they could spell the words "very necessary" with less than nine ciphers attached to it. Their reply was, "Our spelling is absolutely necessary to save the Republic."

THE AUTHORITY

This is the *n*th-plus-1 Commission on Reorganization of the Government in which I have participated in 33 years. Most of such Commissions have been set up by Presidents hopeful that the Congress would listen to the words of wisdom.

In time Congress also became annoyed and concluded to express itself. The preamble of the law establishing the Commission, over which I presided 5 years ago and again today are much alike. This one says:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. * * *

They obviously did not wish to leave out anybody in the executive branch. Then with a certain air of suspicion, it instructs the Commission as to what it must deal with:

"Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

"Consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

"Abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;

"Eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise. * * *

That last line about Government competitive enterprises came back to roost in a report last Monday.

The Commission of 5 years ago was for various reasons unable to deal with policy questions. The authority of this present Commission is, however, wide open. This law says:

"The Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations."

But lest you become frightened, I may disclose to you that we do not intend to toy with the Constitution of the United States.

Also, if you will sometime read the whole law, you will find that the Congress did not want our forces turned loose upon them for they state that we should look into all agencies "except the Judiciary and the Congress."

This law also contains a new authority absent from the last Commission's law. It says, "the Commission * * * may subpoena witnesses and documents and administer oaths." And this applies not only to the public, but to Government officials. I presume this all means we can report inaccuracies to the Attorney General.

Just to relieve your minds, we have refrained from that form of publicity.

ORGANIZING THE WORK

Under the more limited authorities of the first Commission of 5 years ago, we restricted our efforts to straightening out the structure of the executive branch, its housekeeping and the removal of roadblocks to self-reform. That job of repairs was big enough to take 2 years of labor at that time.

Because of the many problems settled by the Commission of 5 years ago, and because of the wider demands and wider authority from the Congress this time, this present Commission undertook a different approach to the problem. This time we mostly organized our investigation and our recommendations not department by department, but along functional lines straight across the whole of the executive front.

In making this straight-across functional investigation, we, for instance, examined and reported upon and made recommendations in 1 document as to the parts of 71 agencies which give medical aid and as to the 104 agencies, parts of which make loans, guaranties and insurance.

This is no trivial job. There are about 1,400 different agencies in the Government spending \$63 billions a year. To do the job, I scarcely need to tell you that we set up some 20 task forces, many of whose leaders are speaking before your sessions. More than 400 leading executives and professional men have joined in this work. All of them are men of distinguished experience in the task for which they were chosen. They have served devotedly during the last 20 months at great personal sacrifice. The Nation owes them a great debt of gratitude.

Last Monday, after some 18 months of hard work, we got around to that remark in the law about elimination of those functions which are competitive with private enterprises. You may have noted that we found them in many agencies of the Government.

There appear to be somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 of them. We have not had the time to dissect all of them.

When we came to look into the history of these Government business enterprises, we found most of them were created in wars and emergencies for some special needed task. But when the task was completed, each had aboard it an empire-seeking bureaucracy and a large pressure group which benefited from it. With these high inspirations, they developed an extraordinary longevity. One of them lasted 36 years and lost money nearly every year. Some of these enterprises are necessary; some are noncompetitive.

Many of them in their accounts claim they earn a profit and are, therefore, a benevolent institution. But all of them are exempt from Federal taxes. Very few of them pay any interest or amortization of the capital the Government had invested in them. And many of them do not include overhead personnel in their expenditures, or pensions and other "fringe benefits." Also, they do not mention the increased taxes the Government would receive if the business were done by private enterprise. Naturally, they are joyous in the demonstration of their great capacity to compete with private enterprise. Our Commission made the remark that this was a strange proceeding in a Government pledged to fair competition.

In a few cases, having no hope of completely recovering our national philosophy of life, we recommended that the Government competitor at least be put on a self-support-basis so as to pay his own expenses. The walls of those agencies and the pressure groups have spread across the land with an accompaniment of impolite remarks.

The loss is not wholly the taxpayers' money. It is also a loss by injury to the vitality of the private enterprise system. It is a destruction of freedoms.

Initiative, ingenuity, and invention seldom come from Government business enterprises. These qualities are not stimulated by their form of accounting and the open doors of the United States Treasury.

Aside from maintaining an economic system of free enterprise which has produced the highest standard of living in all the history of mankind, this system has amply proved its virility in national defense. It provided the inventiveness and the productivity which, second only to the valor of our officers and men, won for us both World War I and World War II.

AN EXPERIMENT

As an example of one of these functional cross sections of the Government and what can be done about it, I may recite an experiment of one of our task forces. It belongs in our department of "the birth control of documents." You no doubt have heard from a number of the 4,700 different varieties of questionnaires the Government sends each year to the commercial world and also to confuse plain people.

Our energetic task force on paperwork management in part I of their report made recommendations that would have \$250 million a year. In part II of their report they relate an experiment. They set up 29 committees in various business groups and secured their views on what could be done to simplify Government questionnaires and still give the Government the information it must have. With these constructive suggestions, our task force members, as a catalyst, brought these industrial committees into meetings with 32 different Government agencies concerned. These meetings have already brought about simplifications which the task force states will save the Government over \$5 million a year; and save those industries over \$10 million a year. We do not regard that \$15 million as revolutionary, but it is 6 times the cost of this whole Commission work.

Having proved its case, the task force suggests that there is room for this catalytic action in the 4,000 forms and reports that they did not examine and a few hundred million more savings. We are recommending that the Government set up a catalyst that works 365 days a year, less holidays.

The Commission has completed and published reports on nine of these functional cross-sections of the executive branch. You will receive 5 more within the next 3 weeks and there are several more in the mill.

The recommendations in our reports are of two sorts. One is: Recommendations or suggestions to the administrative agencies which can be carried out within their present authorities. The other is: Recommendations to Congress for legislation. There are in the first 9 reports about 250 administrative suggestions or recommendations. Many of these have already been adopted. The points for legislative action are about 170 in number. It does not mean 170 bills to be passed. Possibly nine bills would cover these points. Some have already been introduced, and more are to follow.

Now, to improve your higher learning as to civil government you can buy these reports from the Public Printer at prices varying around 45 cents each. Just to indicate that they are not expensive, I may tell you that the annual budget documents will cost you about \$6.75. It is no doubt a romantic document. But it weighs 5 pounds and is set up by the printer in such a way that you cannot read it in bed.

We believe our reports also relate strange things but we have had them set up by the Public Printer in pocket form for your easier homework. As a matter of fact, you can buy the whole lot so far published for less than a high-class novel, and they are a better sleeping pill, provided they do not raise your temperature.

Our job is to search out the systems of organization and administration which need repairs. Some of the ways of managing were good enough before the Government multiplied its size about 14 times in 25 years. Some of these faulty systems are due to obsolete legislation. Some are due to the sacrosanct character of bureaucratic empires. Some are due to the pressure groups that profit from the present setup. Some of these systems are due to the primary human emotion of resentment to being waked up.

The problems we deal with are mostly beyond the remedy of any single officials. And I may say at once that most of the responsible officials in our Government are dedicated and able men and women who are themselves struggling to unwind these tangles.

In demonstrating the weaknesses of certain systems of organization, we, in order to prove it, occasionally presented a "horrid example" of what is happening. Here is where we depart from abstract discussion into the world of furious protest. They make an unfavorable impression on pressure groups and some agencies. So far at least we have not replied to their remarks. That may come later.

Our job is to find ways of saving money. I may tell you that in the reports which we will have completed in the next few days, our separate task forces estimate that an aggregate of \$6 billion of savings could be made to the taxpayer. And beyond that there could be returned to the Treasury about \$7 billion of money which could be provided otherwise. And there are still more to come.

I may emphasize that when we talk about savings, we talk about the elimination of waste and not the strangulation of either our defense or the stifling of public welfare.

Our Commission is not always unanimous, but when you get a recommendation it is usually by a large majority. Nobody can expect that the 12 serious and eminent men of this Commission will always agree about everything.

At the time the Commission of 5 years ago finished its work, loud cries went up from most of the buildings of Washington. There was a barbershop blues incorporating such words as "Your figures are wrong." "You are ignorant. You are unrealistic." "You are reactionaries. You are radical. You seek to destroy the foundations of the Republic."

The chorus was: "It must never come to pass."

Yet 5 years later 70 percent of those recommendations had been adopted and great consequences in more efficient and more economical government have flowed from them.

I am confident that the pressure of American commonsense will secure 70 percent of our present recommendations in the next 5 years.

We have received extraordinary support from the press of the Nation. An analysis of a mass of editorials clipped from newspapers from over all parts of the country shows well over 90 percent favorable as against under 10 percent of brickbats. Some of the brickbats come from the business world.

There is an overall purpose in this work far above the chatter of upset persons. The Republic is beset by many dangers. There is one danger within our power to control. That is the waste which brings in its train our unbalanced budgets. And as sure as the sun sets, continued deficits will bring decreased purchasing power of wages, salaries, and income with all the tumults of striving of groups to protect themselves.

Our job is to show a safe road to a balanced budget. And this is no trivial job. Its accomplishment is vital to every cottage in this land.

But over and above even that, many of these reports spell out ways to strengthen the foundations of the Republic.

A Bill To Amend the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Representative Roy W. Wier, Democrat-Farmer-Labor, of the Third District in the State of Minnesota, introduced in the House of Representatives today a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to include the employees of large interstate retail chain stores and department stores.

In introducing the bill, he said: "The proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act would remove one of the great inequities and injustices under the present act. The amendment would not apply to small corner grocery or drug stores or to similar retail establishments not doing an interstate business but engaged solely in local retailing. Neither does it apply to small department stores nor to small chain stores which do little interstate business. Furthermore, the amendment would enable these small retail outlets to compete more effectively with the larger ones which would be covered by the amendment."

"If the amendment which I have introduced today should become law, every employer who has more than five retail establishments doing interstate business, or having one or more retail establishments in such business with a total annual volume of sales of over \$500,000, would have to pay the minimum wage prescribed by the statute. At the present time, the law provides for a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. An employer covered by the amendment would also have to pay time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of 40 in any workweek or in excess of 8 hours in any one working day."

Representative Wier went on to say: "There are approximately 5.7-million employees working in retail establishments in the United States, representing about 15 percent of the total nonagricultural employment in the country and constitute a part of the employment force which should not be discriminated against under the Federal wage-hour law."

The proposed amendment would cover some 1.7-million employees in the interstate retail store industry, including variety store chains which employ about 71 percent of all variety store workers. The largest of these is the F. W. Woolworth Co. with 1,834 stores and 95,000 employees, being about one-fourth of all variety store employees.

The A. & P. Tea Co. has some 4,600 stores with an annual volume of sales of about \$4-billion. Safeway Stores, Inc., has 1,849 stores; employs about 40,000, while the Kroger Co. with 1,644 stores has some 30,000 employees. S. S. Kresge Co. with 681 stores employs about 35,000; W. T. Grant has 500 stores and works 23,000 people, while J. J. Newberry with 476 stores normally hires 32,000 individuals.

Department store and mail order chains account for about 37 percent of all department store employment. In this field, there is the J. C. Penny Co. (1,647 stores; 56,000 employees, annual sales volume in excess of

\$1.1 billion), Sears, Roebuck & Co., 699 stores; 120,000 employees, annual sales volume of about \$3 billion), Montgomery Ward (568 stores; 53,000 employees), Marshall Field Co., (8 stores, 20,000 workers), R. H. Macy (26 stores, 24,000 employees), Federated Department Stores, Inc., has about 34 stores and 25,000 employees in subsidiaries, such as Bloomingdale Bros., New York City; Filene's Boston, and Fedway Stores of Texas, New Mexico, and California. The Allied Stores Corp. has about 73 outlets with 28,000 employees in Massachusetts, California, Texas, New York, and New Jersey.

"The number of employees working in retail chain drug stores," said Representative Wier, "runs into many thousands in such chains as United Cigar-Whelan Stores Corp., Peoples Drug Stores, and the Rexall Co., while clothing specialty stores, like Bond's and Lerner's, have more than 10,000 employees."

"This amendment will have little effect upon the total wage bill and profits of these large interstate retail businesses, since the number of employees (who are paid less than the present legal minimum of 75 cents an hour) is only about 85,000 or 5 percent of the total number of their employees. In 1948, for instance, the total payroll for such stores equaled only 12 percent of total sales. Similar percentages ranged from a low of 8 percent, for retail food stores, to a high of 19 percent for retail furnishings and appliance stores."

"In the United States there are about 1.4 million retail establishments which employ some 5.7 million people, but only 37,000, less than 3 percent, are of the chain or multi-State type. This 3 percent represents about two-fifths of the total retail employment. It is estimated," said Representative Wier, "that as of September 1953, less than 3 percent of the country's retail outlets had a total volume of sales in excess of \$500,000, but this same 3 percent employed almost 50 percent of all retail people in the country."

Representative Wier further pointed out that, "this amendment has full support and sponsorship of the Retail Clerks International Association, AFL, which is the largest and oldest union in America devoted exclusively to improving the working conditions of retail store employees."

He said, "I am going to do everything within my power to secure the passage of the amendment that I have introduced today to raise the standard of living of the lowest paid group of workers in the country."

Taking Bearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered last Saturday, June 4, by the Honorable James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization, before the American Cotton Congress, Harlingen, Tex.

Mr. McConnell is one of the ablest men in Government. He has taken the lead in working out a sensible cotton export program. His speech should be widely read. It is one of the soundest and finest ever delivered on the cotton question.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING BEARINGS

(Remarks by James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization, at a meeting of the American Cotton Congress, Harlingen, Tex., June 4, 1955)

I cannot honestly say that it is a pleasure for me to address this meeting today. In fact, I—a novice in cotton—can think of no excuse for appearing before this distinguished group, except that I said yes in a moment of weakness.

Regardless, it is a great honor to be invited to attend your conference. It is just that discussing cotton policy, when some of the important answers are not yet known, is a tough assignment.

Under no stretch of the imagination do I presume to be a cotton expert, and I have no license to address you as such. On the other hand, looking at the cotton situation the experts haven't been doing so well. Perhaps under the circumstances I can speak with humility as a layman.

While I am not an expert on cotton, I have spent more than 35 years in the commodity markets—both buying and selling. And never in all my experience have I seen a situation where, when you have something to sell, you announce a year or so in advance that you will not meet your competition.

But that is just what we have been doing for several years with our cotton, setting a point below which we will not sell and thus letting the competition run rampant against us, both in selling and in production.

They have known what to do all right. Foreign cotton acreage is expanding at our expense. The use of synthetics has been increasing, again at the expense of cotton.

I have already stated that we don't have all the answers, but let's do a little job of "taking bearings." We can have a good look at the serious surplus situation of the wrong grades of cotton on one hand, and the deficit of acreage for farmers on the other.

First, let's take bearings on our present cotton policy. Where has it led us with its rigid support features and its rigid export sales prices, geared to the support level?

It seems certain that if we continue this policy we will continue to give up historic American markets to increased foreign growths. You know the story better than I, and I need not cite a lot of statistics. One factual comparison will show what's happened.

Foreign cotton acreage averaged a little under 40 million in the 5 years from 1945 through 1949. It jumped to an average of more than 56 million acres from 1950 through 1954—with the total going above 60 million in 1954. Part of this, of course, was due to postwar recovery. In contrast, United States acreage went down around 7 million acres between 1953 and 1955.

Again, as we hold up prices and limit market supplies, substitutes take over a larger and larger share of the potential outlets for cotton. It is estimated that world consumption of synthetics last year was the equivalent of about 10 million bales of cotton, of which about 3.5 million bales was the United States portion. Synthetics and other competitors have expanded and will continue to do so in a situation where the cotton program holds an umbrella over the entire market.

The Commodity Credit Corporation will probably have around 8 million bales in inventory when it takes over 1953 loan stocks this summer, and 1954 loan stocks later in the year. Our past policy still in effect will insure a continuation of heavy government holdings, unless we continue to cut acreage with all its attendant evils. I judge that

no one seriously thinks we can travel further in this direction.

Now let's take our bearings on an extremely important factor in the whole situation. I refer to the "cotton" Congress in Washington. It writes the laws which control our cotton programs.

Here we see definite indications of understanding and a courageous facing up to the realities of the situations. Senators and Representatives have been speaking out, some of them very boldly, on the basic issues. They are calling attention to the vital necessity of recapturing our export position, as well as realistically serving our domestic outlets for cotton. They see the great danger in drastically reduced cotton acreage. And they recognize the need for better balance and more flexibility in both price support and export programs, so that American cotton can move in the market.

While we are talking about the Congress, let's take some bearings on the law itself—the legislation which controls the operation of our cotton programs.

The first thing we find here is that the present legislation tends to freeze cotton price supports at the maximum 90 percent of parity. Even under the Agricultural Act of 1954, provisions of legislation serve to hold cotton supports at the top of the flexible range. Under the formula of the legislation, production controls take effect before any price adjustment. In fact, under present legislation, it is not likely that cotton price supports would drop materially below the 90 percent top under any probable conditions in the foreseeable future.

The shift to the new or modernized parity formula, scheduled to take effect for the 1956 crop, will bring a slight adjustment. Experience has certainly shown us that a rigid support level—regardless of its value as a temporary expedient to meet a current emergency—can lead to more real trouble if continued on an indefinite basis.

There is another problem in the present legislation which leads to unbalanced pricing and resultant troubles. I refer to the present law requiring the use of Middling $\frac{1}{8}$ as the hinge of the price-support program.

It is generally recognized that Middling $\frac{1}{8}$ inch has not for many years been a representative quality for American upland cotton. The situation is very different than it was when that quality was adopted as the base. Development of improved varieties and other factors have resulted in a marked increase in average staple lengths. The market calls for less of the shorter lengths and more of the others.

As a consequence of sticking to this obsolete formula, the average price support level for all cotton is thrown out of balance. The situation also serves to encourage production of shorter staple lengths—much of which, for lack of market demand, finds its way eventually into CCC stocks. Changing to a more representative base would bring premiums and discounts more in line with the true value of the cotton. Desirable adjustments could be made in support rates for various qualities.

The New York Cotton Exchange 16 years ago changed to Middling $\frac{1}{16}$ as the base for futures trading. Its board of governors has recently recommended a current change to Middling $\frac{1}{8}$ —again in recognition of changing conditions.

A comparable change in the cotton price-support law would certainly seem to be a step in the right direction.

I have already mentioned the fact that, under present legislative provisions, it is not likely that cotton price supports will drop much below the 90-percent maximum—no matter how great the need might be for changes to permit needed adjustments. The support formula as now written sets a supply level 8 percent above the determined normal supply before any adjustments in the support level can begin to take effect.

The program as now operated under the present legislation virtually sets a price level for all CCC sales—both domestic and export—at the "105 percent of support" level which legally governs the minimum price for all domestic sales. If we sell cotton abroad below the domestic price, and make no other changes, we will drive some United States cotton manufacturers out of business. Our textile men would be at a serious disadvantage in competing for foreign sales, and they would need special protection against imports of competing manufactured goods, made from cheaper American cotton than is available to them.

We must not forget that the American cotton mill is the best customer the American cotton farmer has. Therefore, in any cotton-export program, we have to bear in mind the effect of such a program on the domestic textile industry, which buys about 9 million bales of United States cotton and exports the equivalent of about 700,000 bales. This is just another of the serious problems we face in trying to work out sound answers for cotton problems.

How about the farmer in all this? The support programs were intended primarily to help him, and taking bearings on his place in the whole situation is probably most important of all.

In the final analysis, the farmer is the one who has the first and most direct stake in market outlets. If markets are dried up and lost, sooner or later the blow will come right back on the producer. Special measures cannot go on forever plugging up holes left when real markets are gone.

As already mentioned, the producer feels the effect of an unbalanced situation most immediately in the form of acreage controls—limits on his production which are mandatory under the law in the present supply situation. And the producer is already deeply hurt on this score. With present reduced acreage, he cannot operate at full efficiency. If he is one of the thousands of small farmers, he may not be able to operate at all. Producers have a considerable investment in their farm plants, and they can quickly reach the point where loss of volume more than offsets any benefits from attempts to hold prices at set levels.

The results of this taking bearings do not spell out a very encouraging situation, but I am afraid it's a true reflection of what we can expect if we continue to stick rigidly to our present policies and regulations.

It's obvious that one of our first needs is a clarified export sales policy. We need a policy which will keep our cotton in a realistically competitive position, quality considered.

President Eisenhower recently summed up the question of export policy and our international responsibilities as follows:

"The United States cannot be satisfied with the position of holding its own supplies off the market and accumulating surpluses while other countries dispose of their entire production. Accordingly, the United States will offer its products at competitive prices. At the same time, the United States will not use its agricultural surpluses to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodities."

That's a clear expression of sound policy, but in actual practice we have not put our cotton into a competitive position. This is particularly true of certain grades and staples.

It must also be remembered that much of what we have been able to export recently has moved abroad with the help of Government financing.

Considering our export programs, and clarification of our sales policy, it is important to have a proper perspective on the size of the job. We don't need a fire sale. We are not faced with the problem of putting a price on exports to move 15 million

bales next year, or 10 million bales, or even 8 million bales—the size of the probable CCG inventory.

We are thinking in terms of an export program for the coming marketing year which will move around 5 million bales. That's only a million bales or so above exports for the current year, and it isn't a goal which should scare anyone or disrupt world prices. We want every cent we can get for our cotton, but we cannot be bound by advance price-fixing announcements which will emasculate our sales policy.

It is important to make a definite start toward reduction of the surplus, but we do not have to do the whole job in a single year. Considering the fact that this year's reduced acreage should mean a smaller crop, we think we can make a satisfactory adjustment during the year ahead by exporting somewhere around the 5 million bale figure. The carryover is expected to be a little above 10½ million bales this August 1. If we can export 5 million bales, we can hope to reduce the carryover by about 3 million bales or perhaps more during the year, depending of course on the size of this season's crop.

The changes in sales policy which might be needed to export that much cotton—and more important to put the world on notice that we are changing direction and moving back toward our normal place in world cotton trade—need not be drastic enough to be upsetting. We intend to operate on an orderly basis.

We know, as well as you do, that it is very important to get decisions as quickly as possible on cotton policy. But we also know that it would be a mistake to act without a full and careful reappraisal of the whole program.

There isn't any easy way out of our problems—no cheap package of solutions. If there had been, we would have announced it before now. As a matter of fact, it has taken time just to get at the facts of the basic situation—the problems we must try to solve.

This is a double barreled problem. It is apparent that any change in cotton policy which does not include the beginning of some fundamental corrections in the law itself, made concurrently, will fail of a long-term solution.

We also know that any program which does not recognize the needs of all segments of the cotton industry, including manufacturers and shippers as well as producers, will be likely simply to multiply problems for the future. Solutions must be for the long pull, and not just temporary expedients.

If it costs to get things straightened out now, let's be sure that it is a one-time cost, and not a continuing expense to the industry—and to the Treasury.

The administration is deeply concerned with the long-time interests of the American farmer. We intend to keep working toward this objective at all times. In line with this objective, we must avoid falling into the trap of easy answers which might look attractive on the surface—but which could do more harm than good in the long run. And we are thinking primarily of the producer, the farmer who turns out the crops upon which the entire cotton industry is built.

Aware of the need for speed in getting answers, we are working on the overall cotton questions almost continuously. We are conferring regularly with Members of Congress and with farm organization and industry representatives. As you know, early last week the Secretary of Agriculture appointed a special cotton export advisory committee. This committee has already held a preliminary meeting with us in Washington. It is coming in again in a very few days.

We are going to keep right on driving until we come up with some better answers. We hope to have them soon, and hope they will be the right ones—even though it will prob-

ably not be possible to wholly satisfy anyone who has an interest in cotton.

The situation calls for courage, sacrifice, and direct action. There is too much at stake for us to accept temporary, soothing-syrup remedies. We want the sort of sound solutions which will build strongly for the future. And I may say that we are very much encouraged to tackle this problem by the enlightened understanding shown by cotton men in the Congress during recent weeks.

In conclusion, I want to make one final point. The important thing now is to change direction, to get over on a constructive basis for long-range development. How fast we move is of secondary importance. We can make changes gradually in the detail of operations, to avoid unnecessary disturbance anywhere along the line—just as long as we are headed away from the program and policy mistakes which have caused us so much trouble in the past.

Dissent and Separate Statement of Commissioner Chet Holifield on the Hoover Commission Report on Overseas Economic Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the preface to its report on Overseas Economic Operations, the Commission states its concern with finding a "new method of organization" for foreign aid and a program that will increase the economic and military strength of the free world. I do not believe that either objective is furthered by this report.

In the first place, the report does not represent a serious study of organization and management of our foreign aid programs. The multiple agencies and functions concerned with foreign aid are cataloged in the report, but no attempt is made to evaluate their performance or to suggest improved organization.

Secondly, the report intrudes in the area of foreign policy by making restrictive recommendations which could hamper the Executive, antagonize our allies and thwart our objectives.

The lack of organizational study is illustrated by the fact that the report simply lists the several councils, boards, committees, and special assistants who advise the President in this field. A useful service could have been performed by a study of the Executive Office of the President and other agencies in relation to foreign aid, with recommendations to simplify the organizational maze. This the Commission did not do.

It is difficult to determine from the text of the report and recommendations where the Commission stands in relation to the recent Executive order of the President, which stresses the need for unified administration of foreign aid.

When the President issued Executive Order 10610, effective June 30, 1955, abolishing the Foreign Operations Administration and transferring its economic

operations to the Department of State, he emphasized to the Secretary of State the importance of maintaining "a single organization under a single management." The President made it clear that he wanted to "avoid dispersal of operating responsibilities either within the Department or to agencies outside the Department."

In his message to the Congress on the mutual security program, the President again put it as "essential that responsibility for the nonmilitary operations continue unified; to fragment this responsibility among several agencies would seriously detract from their effectiveness"—House Document No. 144, 84th Congress, 1st session, page 5.

The International Cooperation Administration, established by the President as a semiautonomous agency within the State Department, evidently is the result of an effort to preserve the organizational base of foreign aid functions while meeting the objections of those in Congress and elsewhere who believe that these functions should not be administered by a separate agency, such as the Foreign Operations Administration.

To prevent the Secretary of State from being saddled with heavy operating responsibilities, the President proposed that a person of great stature and administrative talent be placed in charge of the new unit within the Department.

The effectiveness of the foreign aid program will depend in large measure, of course, on the administrative ability of the new appointee, his wholehearted acceptance of our foreign-aid objectives, and his willingness to employ the available instruments and resources with boldness and imagination to reach those objectives.

The President's instruction that the International Cooperation Administration use the facilities of other executive agencies, where appropriate, in administering foreign aid, follows the pattern of Foreign Operations Administration agreements with other departments or agencies defining specific relationships and facilities or services to be utilized. These agreements took as their point of departure the instruction in the President's letter of June 1, 1953, to the heads of departments and agencies, as follows:

The Director of the Foreign Operations Administration should take full advantage of the advice and assistance available in other agencies. He should coordinate his operations with related operations in other agencies. At the same time, I expect the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration to maintain full control and direction over all foreign economic and technical assistance programs rather than turn this responsibility over to other agencies.

Recommendation No. 1 of the Commission report seems to accept the pattern outlined by the President even while the Commission suggests there is need for a "new method of organization."

On the other hand recommendations 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 propose that the Export-Import Bank and the Departments of Treasury, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, administer designated categories of foreign aid,

subject to the conditions of recommendation No. 1.

If these several recommendations mean only that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration should utilize other agency facilities and personnel, where appropriate, in carrying out his responsibilities, then nothing new has been added to the President's order. If the recommendations mean something more, then they point in the direction of fragmenting the foreign aid program and scattering the functions of the International Cooperation Administration to the four corners of the executive branch.

The text of the report indicates that further steps are to be taken beyond the organizational concept set forth by the President. In the main the report seems to contemplate that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration would be transformed from an administrator of foreign aid in his own right to a coordination of limited programs carried on by other agencies.

The personnel recommendations likewise are difficult to interpret. At one point the text of the report suggests that a considerable number of Foreign Operations Administration personnel might be transferred to the several agencies designated to perform foreign-aid operations. In recommendation No. 1 it is suggested that existing agency staffs in many cases would be sufficient for these operations.

The recommendation adds that if the agencies "should require additional staff, they should be free to obtain it from any quarter." Is this an invitation to bypass Foreign Operations Administration personnel, who have performed valuable services for their Nation? What about civil service and veterans' preference rights?

Another paragraph of recommendation No. 1 proposes that overseas personnel of the civilian agencies performing foreign-aid functions be subject to the line authority and direction of the United States Chief of Diplomatic Mission in each country. The text proposes that a unified personnel system for civilian service overseas should be established.

The problems and requirements of integrating overseas personnel into a single system deserve careful and extended analysis. Indeed the Commission, in its report on personnel and civil service, promised such a study. The present report contains but a brief paragraph on the subject.

Recommendation No. 2, proposing principles to guide our foreign-aid programs, in my opinion is ill-advised and beyond the proper province of the Commission. We should not wander so far afield from our concern with the organization of the executive branch as to recommend, for example, what kinds of enterprises the United States should sponsor in the Asian-African arc.

A flat injunction against technical assistance to European countries overlooks the important and diverse problems which must be dealt with in the technical assistance framework, whether they be combating communism in the trade unions, breaking down cartel arrangements and restrictive trade practices, promoting tax reform, improving the climate for private investment or developing the standardization of weapons and spare parts.

Again, an injunction against assistance to large manufacturing enterprises elsewhere, whether they be oil in Indonesia or steel plants in India, might put the United States at an extreme disadvantage in contending with Soviet influence.

There is grudging acknowledgment in the report that foreign aid of some sort should be continued. But the recommendations seem to imply that foreign aid is more the product of simple and perhaps foolish benevolence than of hardheaded concern for our own national security and survival.

It is well to remind ourselves that freedom never has been a cheap commodity. In appraising forms of aid to friendly nations, we cannot reduce the problems to the simple alternatives of safe bank loans or charity handouts.

Nor can we overlook the President's reminder that "3 out of every \$4 appropriated for the entire mutual-security program will be immediately spent within the United States for commodities, services, machinery, and other items." Food cotton, coal, and other American goods in abundant or surplus supply will be bought with these dollars for use by friendly countries.

The role our Nation has assumed in world affairs brings with it problems of staggering complexity and cost. It is not surprising that we have made mistakes. But a decade of urgent effort in defense of freedom cannot be measured only by mistakes. Our progress is substantial, our accomplishments impressive.

We must take care lest this progress be halted and these accomplishments demeaned and dissipated by a resurgent isolationism impatient with, or indifferent to, the needs and aspirations of other peoples.

Continued American leadership in the free world and successful resistance to the spread of Communist ideology demand wisdom and statesmanship of the highest order.

They demand boldness and resourcefulness to cope with emergencies and to exploit opportunities which advance the cause of freedom.

Above all, they depend upon mutual respect and understanding among nations engaged in a common quest for peace and security.

I do not see how the Commission's report will aid in achieving the vital objectives we have set in foreign aid.

Statement by Representative James E. Van Zandt, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, June 6, 1955, Urging Immediate Action on Legislation To Further Liberalize the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since my election to Congress in 1938 I have advocated liberalization of the Social Security Act.

For the past several years many of us in Congress pleaded for congressional action on bills that we had sponsored, and it was not until a few years ago that the law was liberalized by increasing benefits and expanding the coverage.

When Congress took this action it failed to reduce the eligibility age of the employee and the widow from 65 to 60 years and to permit retirement because of disability regardless of age.

In addition, Congress neglected to include coverage under the Social Security Act for lawyers and dentists. In a few words, the job of liberalizing the Social Security Act is far from being accomplished.

During the past several months it has been heartening to see so many other Members of Congress advocating what a few of us have sponsored over a period of years.

We hope that with this new-found strength we may be able to get action at this session of Congress on bills that will liberalize the Social Security Act along the lines that many of us have consistently advocated.

Early in this session of Congress I again introduced bills to amend the Social Security Act, all of which are duplicates of bills which I introduced in previous Congresses.

The bills are as follows:

H. R. 854 provides that for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits the age shall be 60 years. This means that the eligibility age for employees and widows is reduced from 65 to 60 years.

H. R. 855 would extend social-security coverage to individuals engaged in the practice of law.

H. R. 862 is a bill prohibiting any State from taking a lien on a person's home as a means of seeking reimbursement for moneys paid him in public assistance benefits.

H. R. 2212 provides that any person covered under the Social Security Act shall be entitled to the same primary and survivors benefit rights during a period of disability as he would be entitled to had he attained retirement age when the disability began. In other words, a disabled person would not be required to wait until he reached age 65 before being entitled to social-security benefits.

H. R. 4752 is a bill designed to extend social-security coverage to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry.

Mr. Speaker, this series of bills represents a program of liberalization of the Social Security Act which I feel is long overdue.

Social-security benefits should be provided at age 60 for all Americans without discrimination and should be in keeping with the present day cost of living.

It is true that it costs money to liberalize the Social Security Act. In my contact with persons whose employment is covered by social security I have found that they are willing to pay the cost of a realistic and adequate program of social-security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we know from past experience that amending the Social Se-

curity Act requires a lot of study. Therefore, I hope that these vital amendments to the Social Security Act will receive at an early date the attention they deserve from the House Ways and Means Committee.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 making temporary provision for payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

My bill is designed to assist municipalities to overcome what has become one of their major problems—that of the Federal Government taking away tax revenue from the municipalities which had been paid on large amounts of real property.

My bill prevents this great inequity created in all our many municipalities when the Federal Government moves in and takes off the local tax rolls billions of dollars of assessed valuations that have heretofore been subject to local taxation.

This inequity is clearly illustrated, in capsule form, by the plight of my own Massachusetts Eighth Congressional District of a serious tax problem created in the city of Everett by the General Electric Corp. operation of a plant for the United States Air Force. This plant is known as Air Force plant No. 28. The whole area of which I speak was owned by the General Electric Corp. from 1911 to 1941. Local taxes were paid to the city of Everett on this area by the General Electric Corp. On March 13, 1941, the area was acquired by the Defense Plant Corporation. Air Force plant No. 28 was built in Everett by the Defense Plant Corporation and leased to the General Electric Corp. during World War II and was then known as Plancor 46. It is to be noted that the Defense Plant Corporation during World War II paid taxes to the city of Everett during the fiscal years of 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945.

The Defense Plant Corporation was dissolved July 1, 1945. The same day, July 1, 1945, the property in question was then acquired by another governmental agency, namely, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Once again taxes were paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the city of Everett for the fiscal years of 1946, 1947, and 1948. In 1948 the property was assessed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the amount of \$1,905,000.

This property was then conveyed to the Air Force of the United States by the purely paper sale under the provisions

of Public Law 364, 80th Congress, on a nonreimbursable basis. Approximately \$50,000 of new construction has been added and approximately \$125,000 has been required for rehabilitation. However, Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention that from September 7, 1948, up until the present time not 1 cent of taxes has been paid to the city of Everett for this very valuable property. This has resulted in an unfair tax loss to the city of Everett of approximately \$90,000 annually. In view of the mounting cost of welfare, fire, police, and other services afforded by Everett to its citizens and taxpayers this tax loss has become a severe hardship on the people of that hard working community. What is more amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that during this period and despite the fact that the city of Everett has not received 1 cent of tax from any source on that valuable property, there has been no hesitation to demand from the city of Everett that this factory be supplied water, fire and police protection, and adequate sewerage facilities. What is even more astonishing is the fact that during the summer of 1953 when the duly accredited collective bargaining agency was out on strike at this General Electric operation the officials of that company demanded that the city of Everett furnish police coverage at the plant with no expense to be charged to the General Electric plant.

It is pointed out that police coverage was furnished. Who paid the cost? The long-suffering taxpayers of the city of Everett. It is interesting to note that at the time of the request for police protection no request was made for same by the Federal Government who are supposedly owners of the plant. Here we have a Government-owned plant which is operated by a private corporation for one purpose and one purpose only—that of making a profit for the stockholders of the company. While it is perfectly clear that this is a legitimate ambition and one to be encouraged under our free enterprise system, it also seems to me that such a company which is privately operated should not be operated at the expense of the long suffering local taxpayers of the city of Everett.

It is clearly not fair nor in keeping with the best tradition of the free enterprise system to have property of this nature tax free while other similarly located plants pay their fair share of costs to the city from whence their necessary local services flow.

I ask the question, Why should the Army Air Force be the first of a number of Government agencies to refuse to pay taxes when in fact the Army Air Force does not run the factory but merely is the fee holder of ownership papers? It is perfectly clear that the General Electric Corp. runs and operates this factory and it is equally clear that General Electric along with the other industries of the city of Everett should pay their fair share of the tax-poor city.

The city of Everett has a population of some 46,000 but an area of only 3.61 square miles, so you can readily see that available land is at a premium and that the city of Everett can ill afford to lose any valuation. Their assessed valuation,

both real and personal approximates some \$99 million. There are in the city of Everett 6 major industries, 5 of which pay taxes and the sixth of which I speak does not, yet receives the same benefits and privileges as the other 5 major industries including access to a highly skilled labor market.

I say to the Members of this House that this situation in Everett cannot be permitted to go on year after year. It is clearly not fair that this transfer of property from one Government agency to another Government agency should change the tax rights. The first Government agency paid taxes to the city of Everett; why should the second Government agency, acting merely in its capacity as landlord, not pay? The inhabitants of the city of Everett as a majority are a working class ranging in salary from \$3,000 to about \$6,000 per year, with the average home being assessed in the neighborhood of \$5,000. The good people of Everett can no longer afford to carry the United States Government or the General Electric Co. on their back to the tune of a \$2 million valuation free ride.

It is to meet situations of that character that I have introduced this proposed legislation.

Some 60 other properties, largely industrial in nature, in 20 States would also be affected by my bill, according to a list furnished by the Bureau of the Budget. I would like to point out that the payments assured by my bill will provide badly needed revenue for State and local governments and school districts in which those plants are located. In my home State of Massachusetts there are at least four such plants receiving services such as sewage disposal and water without reimbursing localities in like proportion to other similar plants. It has also been brought to my attention that school districts throughout the Nation have been educating children of parents employed in many of those federally owned plants also without paying for those services in like proportion to other school taxpayers.

The President has recognized the plight of local units of governments and their difficulty in obtaining adequate revenue to provide necessary local services, particularly in the light of heavy Federal taxation and extensive real property holdings by Federal agencies. In fact, on March 30, 1953, he requested the establishment of a commission to study and make recommendations with respect to the Federal Government programs as they affect States and their political subdivisions. This Commission, better known as the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, after 2 years of study, has recently filed its comprehensive report. On the subject of payment in lieu of taxes the Commission said in part:

The Commission recommends that the National Government inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of property taxes to State and local governments. The most important class of properties on which such payments should be made is commercial or industrial properties. Special assessment payments and transitional payments in lieu of taxes should be made in certain cases.

The Commission believes that these payments are necessary to help preserve financially healthy local governments. Present tax immunities of Federal property have weakened many local governments. The States and the National Government share in the responsibility for avoiding actions which impair the financial ability of local governments. Equity as between Federal and local taxpayers requires the National Government to make appropriate payments. These should be based largely on the property tax system, which is the main source of local revenue.

I am happy that the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations endorses the objective of my bill. I am firmly of the opinion that the Federal Government does have an obligation and a positive duty to correct situations that arise through no fault of the local governments whose tax base is being whittled away through exemption rights possessed by the Federal Government.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the 30th of May has recently passed where we adhered to the famous General Order No. 11 issued by Gen. John A. Logan, Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, when he proclaimed May 30 as a day to be set aside to strew flowers upon the graves and to pay tribute to all comrades of all wars who paid the supreme sacrifice that we might enjoy freedom and democracy in this great land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of going back to my district in southern Illinois on Memorial Day and speaking at several different memorial services; one being at Mound City National Cemetery, Mound City, Ill. I was happy to accept these speaking engagements because I felt what little I might do or say would not begin to pay the great debt that you and I owe to these gallant heroes who have paid the supreme sacrifice on the sacrificial altar.

Yes, we owe a debt that we can never pay because "greater love hath no man than this; than he who is willing to lay down his life for his friends." And I say to you what more could a man give than his life. So I say to every American in this country that we have an obligation to keep America free. In order to do this we must rededicate our hearts and our lives to God and country not only on the 30th of May each year but the other 364 days as well. Mr. Speaker, to keep faith with them, it must be a full-time job.

I wish to include in the RECORD two poems, one written by a good friend in my district, Mr. Ike Williford, of Eldorado, Ill., entitled "The Unknown

Soldier," and the second poem I am sorry to say I do not know the author:

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

(By Ike Williford)

From the beggar's stalls in Tunis,
To the walls of Stalingrad,
Across the jungles of New Guinea,
To the green of Erin's sod.
Near the crumbling towers of Bautzen,
To the waters of the Seine,
From Korea's frozen paddies,
To the sands of El Alamein.
A silence shrouds these battlements,
And the caisson's lusty roar,
No longer calls the surging tides,
Of the mighty God of war.
Through sacrifice the soldier wins,
Some small measure of acclaim,
Yet there be men who would now pluck,
From the valor of his name.
We soon forget his dying charge,
And the cause that once seemed just,
Lie buried with the broken blade,
In the soldier's crimson dust.
When the chants of war are silenced,
And the words of praise have flown,
The soldier finds his resting place,
In a tomb that's marked unknown.
Until our Lord shall rent these tombs,
And the soldier must depart,
May his hallowed deeds of glory,
Be engraved upon our hearts.
So let us consecrate our lives,
To the peace we must attain,
Then heroes sleeping in these fields,
Shall not have died in vain.

Is it enough to think today

Of all our brave, then put away
The thought until a year has sped?

Is this full honor for our dead?

Is it enough to sing a song

And deck a grave; and all year long

Forget the brave who died that we

Might keep our great land proud and free?

Full service needs a greater toll—

That we who live give heart and soul

To keep the land they died to save,

And be ourselves, in turn, the brave.

Poor Housing Poses Threat to Urban Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include a noteworthy address by my colleague on the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY. The address, which was delivered at the annual banquet of the north central regional council of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials held at the Commodore Perry Hotel in Toledo, Ohio, on May 23, 1955, follows:

Thank you very much. If I were to say that the very kind invitation to address you this evening was accepted by me with unmitigated pleasure, I would be guilty of a half-truth (or possibly even less), and, of course, this is dangerous for anyone, especially one engaged in political or public activity.

For me to address you on the subject of public housing, slum clearance, and the related areas included in urban renewal puts me in the position of a carrier of coals to Newcastle, and if there's anything worse it's a carrier of coals to Newcastle who arrives at Newcastle only to find that what he carried is an inferior substitute for coal.

I think it's personal fear which is responsible for a certain and perhaps sizable share of the so-called wisdom which Members of Congress either have ascribed to them or, in the absence of this, ascribe to themselves. I've often thought that if it weren't for the voluminous and generally frantic research which the congressional expert is forced to undertake before fulfilling his speaking obligations, he would be far less of an expert than he is cracked up to be and under certain circumstances, and this is the real motivating fear, he might even make a complete fool of himself.

This is simply by way of saying at the outset that I know considerably more about the areas in which all of you are so vitally interested than I did a month ago. And I think this is fine and as it should be, and certainly I don't offer this up as any sort of an apology. As many of you know, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I'm privileged to sit, is so-called because it has jurisdiction over (1) public and private housing; (2) financial aid to commerce and industries; (3) price controls of commodities, rents, and services; (4) deposit insurance; (5) Federal Reserve System; (6) gold and silver, including coinage; (7) issuance of notes and redemption thereof; (8) valuation and revaluation of the dollar; and also over banking and currency.

You know along about last Tuesday, just when I was finishing my research, I was advised by my very efficient office here in Toledo that my engagement this evening might possibly be complicated by the fact that there was certain verbal activity taking place locally between various officials on the very subject I planned to discuss. I told them that I had taken judicial notice of the reports in the Toledo Blade and Times and that I hoped to come in on a wavelength which wouldn't interfere.

So having failed to disturb me on that score, my good assistants announced in rather pleased tones that I would undoubtedly address a number of men and women who view the merits of public housing with a rather jaundiced eye, and perhaps with no eye at all.

JOINT ACTIVITY REQUIRED

I could only reply to this that the subject matter was extremely broad and complicated, and that since I would be talking to experts my best hope of getting a base hit would be to take an honest swing rather than a cautious one.

This may sound funny to you, but in my original draft I got into the meat of my talk with a statement to the effect that I was sure we could all agree that, at the present time, shelter constitutes a very real material need—above politics, which requires for its solution some sort of joint activity by private enterprise and by the Federal Government through low-cost public housing.

Having laid this seemingly solid foundation, my talk began to go together very nicely until I suddenly overheard what was being said before the Senate Housing Committee. The words which I overheard were those of Henry Waltemade, of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, whose broad experience led him to state that "it is politically and morally wrong to require the taxpaying public to subsidize the shelter of the privileged few. Public housing is unnecessary because of the high volume of home construction * * * and the continued marked reduction in the number of low-income persons since 1946."

This pronouncement, of course, destroyed the foundation I had been building on, since in one sweeping blow it indicted public housing as both politically immoral and unnecessary.

After recovering from my initial surprise, that a person could actually get paid for making a statement of this sort, I decided to start over again by saying that I am here tonight because I believe just as strongly as Mr. Waltemade—and I think with a good deal more reason—that Federal aid to low-rent public housing is both a legitimate and a necessary function of Government, so long as private enterprise is unable to provide decent, safe, and sanitary shelter at rents low-income families can afford to pay.

From the bleating outcries from some quarters, you'd think Government responsibility in this area was no more than a deliberate and devious device to compete with private enterprise.

Actually nothing could be further from fact. The bipartisan supporters of the Housing Act of 1949 and of subsequent public housing amendments to the bill have almost unanimously agreed that the job of providing decent housing at reasonable rates for low-income families is properly the function of private enterprise.

WHERE GOVERNMENT FITS IN

The sole question is whether it has done or is doing the job? If not, then it falls within the legitimate province of the Government to meet this human need until such time as private enterprise is able to fulfill the function.

Despite Mr. Waltemade's profound utterances to the contrary, the volume of construction today is far from sufficient to provide shelter for those whom he terms "privileged few"; that is, those whose low income presently qualifies them for public housing.

The late Senator Taft, who in Mr. Waltemade's book would be a politically immoral supporter of public housing, stated in 1949 that the ratio of public housing to private housing would have to be at least 1 to 10 to meet the increasing need for low-rent shelter in the United States. But from 1950 through 1954 there was a total of only 230,000 public-housing units started as against nearly 6 million private units. Instead of public housing providing 1 unit for every 9 by private enterprise, the ratio from 1950 through 1954 was 1 public unit for every 26 private.

Yet if we ask whether private enterprise has done the job during this period, or whether it shows any signs or possibility of doing the job in the foreseeable future, the answer has to be "no." Private enterprise has done a good job but it hasn't done and can't do the whole job.

The more than 1 million new nonfarm units provided annually by private enterprise since 1950 have benefited mainly people able to pay the market price of the homes provided by private enterprise. There has been little abandoning of substandard housing for better quarters and most of the progress which has been made in this area has come from Government construction for low-income families.

THE ILL-HOUSED FIFTH

The appalling fact is that today one-fifth of our Nation continues to be ill housed. Despite the heavy construction since 1950, of the forty-odd million nonfarm homes in the United States, more than 11 million still need major improvements today. According to the last statistics of the Census Bureau, 8½ million nonfarm dwellings lack private indoor flush toilets and another 3.2 million dwellings were classed as dilapidated.

All of you know that these aren't just dry statistics. These figures tell the story of a human need which hasn't been faced squarely by private enterprise or by our Government.

The philosophy of our present administration was clearly stated last January in President Eisenhower's budget message when he said: "The basic principle underlying budget recommendations for programs in the field of transportation, housing, and business is that the national interest is best served by privately owned and operated industry, which is assisted by a minimum of Federal funds and Federal basic facilities operated at the lowest feasible cost and financed, where possible, by charges levied on the users of the services."

This is the kind of statement which is impossible to disagree with, because it doesn't really mean anything until you find out, in terms of positive programs, what is meant by such phrases as "a minimum of Federal funds" and how far the actual figures go in meeting the housing needs of our people.

We do begin to get a pretty clear idea of what the present administration has in mind in the field of public housing from the fact that a total of less than 55,000 public-housing starts were made in 1953 and 1954, as compared with nearly 130,000 in the preceding 2 years of the Truman administration.

AN INFINITESIMAL EXPENDITURE

And I think this picture becomes clearer when we consider the infinitesimal housing expenditure of only \$12 million for fiscal year 1956. Actually, the Government proposes to put up \$301 million for public housing, veterans housing, urban renewal, and other home-building projects, but the Treasury expects to take in \$289 million from Fannie Mae, FHA, and other self-supporting Government agencies assisting private housing.

In view of the fact that other welfare programs are slated to receive Federal aid amounting to more than \$2 billion, I think the conclusion is inescapable that the present administration is doing little more than paying lip service to the need for public housing.

Whether or not Congress will provide some teeth to give this lip service meaning remains to be seen. As you know, the Senate has just concluded hearings and the House Committee on Banking and Currency today began hearings on the same legislation.

My own view, as you may have suspected by now, is that greatly increased public housing is urgently needed to meet the problem threatening our urban civilization. It's also my view, as well as many of my colleagues in Congress, that our housing laws must be liberalized to allow aged and single persons to qualify for public housing projects and to make it possible for public housing and urban renewal projects to dovetail more closely and more effectively.

PUBLIC IS UNINFORMED

I'm sure many of you will agree with me that the slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs under the Housing Act of 1949 and the urban renewal extensions under the Housing Act of 1954 though inadequate are absolutely essential weapons in attacking the core of the housing problem. The job which you and other housing and redevelopment officials are doing is one of the most dramatic in America today, but it is a story which most Americans know little about, and, of course, this makes your task all the more difficult.

For example, I wonder how many people have been startled by the fact that slum and blighted areas comprise nearly 20 percent of the metropolitan residential areas in the United States? And I wonder how many realize that these blighted districts account for 33 percent of the population, 35 percent of the fires, 45 percent of the major crimes, and 55 percent of the juvenile delinquents, and 50 percent of the arrests in our cities? I wonder how many realize that this 20 per-

cent of our metropolitan areas accounts for 50 percent of the disease and 60 percent of the city tuberculosis victims? And I wonder how many know, outside of our city officials and those of you who make this work your life, that only 6 percent of urban real estate tax revenues are collected from these extensive blighted areas while they account for 45 percent of city service costs?

COMMUNITY UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

It seems to me that these basic facts have to be known if your programs and efforts are to have any meaning. Actually, of course, such community understanding is one of the seven requirements of the workable program which each city must present in order to qualify for financial aid for urban renewal projects, and I think this is as it should be, without community understanding there is no hope for community participation and without community participation there can be no real hope of meeting the slum problem successfully. The kind of organization which developed in New Orleans, where every church, school, and civic group unified in a joint effort, is perhaps the ideal, but it was attained and I am told that it was an essential ingredient to the successful job which was done against great odds.

It also seems to me that city people should know what can be done under the urban renewal provisions of the Housing Act of 1954. They should know that the Federal Government pays two-thirds of the net cost of a redevelopment project, and that the city puts up the remaining one-third, using public improvements as a credit against its one-third share, but even more relevant, in many areas, is the knowledge that Federal aid can be obtained on the same two-thirds to one-third basis even where there are no slums to clear and without the acquisition and sale back characteristics of rehabilitation.

I've noticed in the Toledo Blade during the past week or so, a number of statements from public officials. The municipal league and other sources urging that bond issues be reserved for "critically needed projects of long-term usefulness."

PROJECT OF REAL USEFULNESS

Certainly, no project is more critically needed or of more long-term usefulness than urban renewal, but I wonder if enough every-day citizens know this? How many know that the Federal Government is ready to assume two-thirds of the cost of preparing the plan, the cost of public improvements, the net cost of any property that has to be acquired, and the cost of carrying out the voluntary rehabilitation program?

It seems to me that this knowledge is just as important as a workable plan, because those are conditions precedent to obtaining Federal and local shares of the cost of urban renewal projects.

Finally, and this you know far better than I, there is the basic necessity for America to know just why the housing needs of our Nation have not been met, and why they cannot be met under the regulations and policies which prevail today. The not-so-fine sounding program authorizing construction of 35,000 public-housing units this year is nothing short of a hoax. In the first place, something like 143 units have been authorized in 11 months; and in the second place, 35,000 low-rent units a year bears no relation whatever to the needs of tens of millions of human beings.

Clean, decent, and healthy American cities, devoid of slums and blighted neighborhoods, are so possible that it is almost sinful to let the existing rotten core continue to eat away our urban centers. It's been done in Europe and it can be done here. But our Government must be made to face the overall problem squarely, and to look at the total need, no matter how ugly or embarrassing it may be.

When an honest effort is made to think in terms of the needs of the 165 million people today, and the 190 million in 1965, and the 200 million in 1970, then, and only then, can we expect honest and effective Governmental action.

TWO MILLION UNITS A YEAR

If we are to meet the challenge of our soaring population and at the same time counter the growing slum areas of today, we must begin to think and plan in terms of 2 million new housing units a year.

Private enterprise must expand its facilities to take care of 1.8 million units annually, and Government must assist, not only the existing programs, but through new ones which will give credit assistance to the millions of potential middle-income owners.

Public housing must hatch from its present dormant state and provide decent shelter for 200,000 individuals or families annually, especially, but not exclusively, those displaced by renewal projects.

This will call for immediate liberalization of the binding restrictions which now keep public housing and urban renewal separated and it will necessitate a long overdue showdown with the special interests which

have so long and so effectively blocked effective action by you and by others who seek to make decent minimum housing available to all of our citizens.

I know that all of this is easier said than done, but it must be done because the need is real and because it goes to the very core of our national life.

HIGH PRICE OF FAILURE

Under the circumstances which exist today, the efforts of urban housing commissions are bound to hit snags and to appear to be slow moving, but I feel confident, especially here in Toledo, that progress is being made, because the facts are beginning to come out, and people from Boston and Los Angeles are beginning to be aware of the dreadful price which all of us, all over the country, must pay for allowing slums and substandard housing to perpetuate themselves.

We in Congress and you in the field can move forward only as fast as informed public opinion will let us. Given the facts, the people of the United States have a way of getting behind a program which makes us a Nation unto ourselves. Given the facts, we exact honest and positive action from public

officials on every level of government and we do it democratically, too.

The job before us is not an easy one nor is it one of short duration. This you know under the best of circumstances, it would take a decade to finally meet the housing needs of the Nation.

GOAL MUST BE REACHED

But gradually we are gaining and eventually we will reach our goal. When this will be depends largely, I think, on the degree of public support and participation, and on the degree of effective cooperation between citizens, administrators, and public officials.

In closing, I want to assure you of my own deep seated and continuing interest in the vital field of housing and redevelopment, and that of a great number of my colleagues with whom I am privileged to serve in Congress.

But more especially, I want to extend my congratulations to all of you for the difficult work you are doing and the strides you have made.

I hope that we in Congress can make your work less arduous and that the near future will see our joint efforts begin to pay the real dividends which we feel are the right of every American.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1955

Rev. Ralph L. Buchanan, pastor, Hawfield Presbyterian Church, Mebane, N. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, as we bow in recognition of our need and of Thy limitless ability to help us, we would thank Thee for the kindness of Thy providence in placing us in this good land. Help us to do only those things which would pass on to our posterity a greater heritage than that which we have known.

We would pray, our Father, that Thou would bless the Members of this great body. Guide and direct them in all their deliberations and actions. We pray that Thou will help them to know that to err in vision is to stumble in judgment, and that they may so direct the affairs of this Nation that it may be to the world a beaconlight of righteousness, justice, freedom, and good will.

We make our prayer in the name of Him who said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DOUGLAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Monday, June 6, 1955, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been informed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations that the Subcommittee on Investigations has very important witnesses it desires to hear this afternoon. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Benjamin M. Tashiro, of Hawaii, to be

circuit judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION ON DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTINUANCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation